DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 569 LI 000 595

REFERENCE AND RESEARCH LIBRARY NEEDS IN MICHIGAN: A STUDY OF RESOURCES, NEEDS AND PATTERNS OF USE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN SERVICE.

Nelson Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Michigan State Library, Lansing.

Pub Date Nov 66

Note-197p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.96

Descriptors-LIBRARIES, LIBRARY COLLECTIONS, *LIBRARY COOPERATION, *LIBRARY FACILITIES, LIBRARY PROGRAMS, *LIBRARY REFERENCE SERVICES, *LIBRARY SERVICES, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Identifiers-*Michigan

The objectives of the study were to determine the extent and nature of unmet needs of users of reference and research library resources and to propose measures to meet those needs. Data on research library use were collected by 3 questionnaires sent to 4 groups of users: 1) all faculty members of 4-year public and private institutions of higher education in Michigan, 2) all teachers of off-campus university courses from the 9 public universities and colleges offering such programs, 3) a sample of elementary and secondary public school teachers, and 4) a sample of manufacturing executives. Interviews with selected librarians, faculty members, and administrators yielded additional data. A study of inter-library loan slips and non-registered borrowers' cards from selected major libraries in the state, and earlier studies and reports of libraries complete the data sources. The 5 major recommendations are (1) Establish intermediate reference centers, (2) Designate as statewide resource libraries the Detroit Public Library, the Michigan State Library and the libraries of Michigan State University, Wayne State University and the University of Michigan, (3) Provide library collections and facilities for off-campus students, (4) The Michigan State Library should prepare and distribute a Union list of serials, and (5) Establish a Coordinate Council on Reference and Research Library Resources. (CC)

REFERENCE AND RESEARCH LIBRARY NEEDS IN MICHIGAN

A Study of Resources, Needs and Patterns of Use, with Recommendations for Improvements in Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REFERENCE AND RESEARCH LIBRARY NEEDS IN MICHIGAN

A Study of Resources, Needs and Patterns of Use, with Recommendations for Improvements in Service

by

Nelson Associates, Incorporated

November 1966

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS ~~COPYRIGHTED~~ MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Michigan State Board for Libraries TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

This report is submitted solely for the information and benefit of the client to whom it is addressed.

MEMBERS OF THE REFERENCE AND RESEARCH RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Fred J. Bassett	Librarian, The Upjohn Company, Kalamazoo
Dr. Richard Chapin	Director of the Library, Michigan State University
Mr. Wen Chao Chen	Librarian, Kalamazoo College
Dr. W. H. Combs	Dean, University Services, Michigan State Univerrity
Dr. Orville L. Eaton	Librarian, Central Michigan University
Dr. E. W. Erickson	Librarian, Eastern Michigan University
Mrs. Gloria Evans	Librarian, Parke-Davis Company, Production/Engineering Division, Detroit
Miss Clover Flanders	Chief of Extension, General Library, University of Michigan
Mr. Stephen Ford	Librarian, Grand Valley State College
Mr. Robert W. Gibson	Librarian, General Motors Corporation, Warren
Miss Katharine Harris	Reference Service Director, Detroit Public Library
Dr. John Higgins	Bureau of Higher Education, Michigan State Department of Education
Dr. Robert Hubbard	Director of Instititional Research, Wayne State University
Rev. Robert Kearns	Librarian, University of Detroit
Mr. Michael Krenitsky	Librarian, Michigan Technological University
Rev. J. V. McGlynn	Dean of the Graduate School, University of Detroit
Dr. James W. Miller	President, Western Michigan University
Mrs. Lorraine B. Phillips	Librarian, Engineering and Research Staff Library, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn
Dr. G. Flint Purdy	Director of the Library, Wayne State University
Dr. Jack Rombouts	Assistant to the President, Northern Michigan University
Dr. Allan F. Smith	Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Michigan
Dr. Harold E. Sponberg	President, Eastern Michigan University
Dr. Olaf W. Steg	Dean, School of Fine and Applied Art, Central Michigan University
Dr. Katharine M. Stokes	Librarian, Western Michigan University
Dr. Ralph A. Ulveling	Director, Detroit Public Library
Dr. Frederick W. Wagman	Director, General Library, University of Michigan
Miss Helvi Walkonen	Librarian, Northern Michigan University
Dr. Walter W. Waring	Chairman, Department of English, Kalamazoo College

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED • 845 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022 • 212 HA 1-3110

November 18, 1966

Dr. Clare L. Taylor, Chairman
State Board for Libraries
c/o Michigan State Library
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Dr. Taylor:

We submit herewith our report containing the findings of our survey of library needs and patterns of use among major users of reference and research library resources in Michigan, together with our recommendations for new initiatives building upon the strong foundation already established by Michigan's many well-developed libraries.

Michigan is one of the leading states in library development today. We hope that the recommendations we have made will play a part in maintaining your leadership position and we are proud to have had this opportunity of working with you and your professional colleagues in analyzing the current needs in the state.

Because a substantial part of this study has consisted of the collection of new data, we have depended heavily upon librarians, faculty members, government officials, school teachers, and manufacturing executives everywhere in the state to supply information and to respond to our requests for interviews and other forms of assistance. We are quite conscious of our debt to these many people and, by means of this letter, we want to express our appreciation for the ready assistance we have received in all quarters.

We stand ready to assist you in any way we can to interpret the findings of our study and to implement the proposals we have made for strengthening library resources and services in Michigan.

Very truly yours,

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED

MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS • CABLE ADDRESS: NELSONCONS • BRANCH OFFICE: WASHINGTON, D. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION i

PART ONE REFERENCE AND RESEARCH NEEDS AND PATTERNS OF LIBRARY USE AMONG MAJOR PATRON GROUPS

Chapter I University and College Faculty and Students 1

Chapter II Faculty and Students in Off-Campus Programs 24

Chapter III Elementary and Secondary School Teachers 32

Chapter IV Manufacturing Executives and Government Officials 41

PART TWO FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 50

APPENDIXES: QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

A. Responses of University and College Faculty

B. Responses of Faculty of Off-Campus Programs

C. Responses of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers

D. Responses of Manufacturing Executives

E. Copies of Questionnaires

Exhibit I
Exhibit II
Exhibit III
Exhibit IV

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Chapter I Table 1. Area of Specialization 2

Table 2. Academic Rank 2

Table 3. Length of Service at Present Institution 3

Table 4. Frequency of Use of Major Michigan Libraries 4

Table 5. General Adequacy of Campus Library — All Respondents 5

Table 6. Adequacy of Campus Library by Academic Area 6

Table 7. Adequacy of Campus Library by Present Research Activities 6

Table 8. Main Reasons for Using Libraries Other Than Campus Library 7

Table 9. Non-Registered Borrowers' Cards Summary — Week of March 14-18, 1966 9

Table 10. Best Collection in Field of Specialization 10

Table 11. Use of Library Materials 11

Table 12. Frequency of Use and Adequacy of Selected Library Services 12

Table 13. Distribution of Interlibrary Loans and Photoduplication Requests for Selected Michigan Libraries (Percent of Total Transactions) 14

Table 14. Use of Out-of-State Libraries 15

Table 15. Adequacy of Campus Library for Undergraduate Students 16

Chapter I Table 16. Future Undergraduate Library Material Needs 18
Table 17. Adequacy of Campus Library for Graduate Students 19
Table 18. Use of Other Than Campus Library for Selected Types of Assignments 20
Table 19. Future Graduate Student Needs for Selected Library Materials 21

Chapter II Table 1. Distribution by Academic Area 25
Table 2. Differences in Assignments by Faculty to Off-Campus and On-Campus Students 26
Table 3. Selected Library Resources Compared On-Campus and Off-Campus 27
Table 4. Types of Libraries Used by Off-Campus Students Other Than On-Site Library 29

Chapter III Table 1. Distribution of Responses by Geographic District 33
Table 2. Subject Areas in Which Library Materials Are Periodically Used 35
Table 3. Types of Libraries Used Periodically 36
Table 4. Frequency of Library Use 36
Table 5. Adequacy of Selected Libraries for Professional Needs 37
Table 6. Reasons (Other Than Convenience of Location) for Selecting a Library as Most Important 38

Chapter IV Table 1. Distribution of Responses by Number of Employees in Company 41

Table 2. Distribution of Responses by Geographic District 42

Table 3. Distribution of Responses by Area of Primary Executive Responsibility 43

Table 4. Sources of Information for Business Executives in Order of Importance 44

Table 5. Use of Library Materials in Selected Subject Matter Areas 45

Appendix A Table A- 1. Faculty Questionnaire Response

Table A- 2. Most Important Library for Professional Needs by School

Table A- 3. Most Important Library by Academic Area of Specialization

Table A- 4. Most Important Library by Type of Research

Table A- 5. Adequacy of Campus Library in Field of Specialization

Table A- 6. Adequacy of Campus Library in Field of Specialization by Rank of Teacher

Table A- 7. Adequacy of Campus Library in Field of Specialization by Length of Service

Table A- 8. Frequency of Use of Campus Library by Academic Area

Table A- 9. Frequency of Use of Campus Library by Type of Research

Table A-10. Need for Access to Stacks by Academic Area

Appendix A Table A-11. Need for Access to Stacks by Type of Research

Table A-12. Other Michigan Libraries Used by at Least 25 Respondents

Table A-13. Michigan Library with Best Collection in Field of Specialization by Academic Area

Table A-14. Michigan Library with Best Collection in Field of Specialization by Type of Research

Table A-15. Interlibrary Loan Service — Frequency of Use and Adequacy of Service by School

Table A-16. Interlibrary Loan — Reasons for Rating Service as Fair or Poor

Table A-17. Photoduplication Service — Frequency of Use and Adequacy of Service by School

Table A-18. Photoduplication Service — Reasons for Rating Fair or Poor

Table A-19. Microfilm Readers/Printers — Frequency of Use and Adequacy of Service by School

Table A-20. Microfilm Readers/Printers — Reasons for Rating Fair or Poor

Table A-21. Frequency of Use of Selected Library Services by Academic Area

Table A-22. Frequency of Use of Selected Library Services by Type of Research

Table A-23. Use of Library Materials by Academic Area

Table A-24. Undergraduate Needs: Depth of Collection in Fields Taught by Respondent, by School

Table A-25. Undergraduate Needs: General Breadth of Collection in Campus Library

Appendix A Table A-26. Undergraduate Needs: Availability of Multiple Copies in Campus Library

Table A-27. Undergraduate Needs: Campus Library, Depth of Collection in Field of Specialization by Academic Area

Table A-28. Undergraduate Needs: Availability of Multiple Copies in Campus Library by Academic Area

Table A-29. Libraries (Other Than Campus Library) Most Used by Undergraduates

Table A-30. Undergraduate Needs: Tailoring of Reading Lists to Campus Materials

Table A-31. Undergraduate Needs: Tailoring of Reading Lists to Campus Materials by Academic Area

Table A-32. Undergraduate Use of Off-Campus Libraries Required for Course Work or Term Papers and Special Assignments

Table A-33. Undergraduate Use of Off-Campus Libraries Required for Course Work or Other Assignments by Academic Area

Table A-34. Future Undergraduate Use of Selected Library Materials by Academic Area

Table A-35. Depth of Campus Library Collection in Fields You Teach for Graduate Students' Needs

Table A-36. General Breadth of Campus Library Collection for Graduate Students' Needs

Table A-37. Availability of Multiple Copies for Graduate Students' Needs in Campus Library

Table A-38. Adequacy of Campus Library for Graduate Students' Needs by Field of Study

Appendix A Table A-39. Expectation That Graduate Students Will Use Library Resources Other Than Campus Library by School

Table A-40. Expectation That Graduate Students Will Use Library Resources Other Than Campus Library by Field of Study

Table A-41. Use of Reading Lists for Graduate Students' Course and Seminar Work Tailored to Library Materials Available on Campus by School

Table A-42. Use of Reading Lists for Graduate Students' Course and Seminar Work Tailored to Library Materials Available on Campus by Field of Study

Table A-43. Use of Reading Lists for Theses and Dissertations Tailored to Library Materials on Campus by School

Table A-44. Use of Reading Lists for Theses and Dissertations Tailored to Library Materials on Campus by Field of Study

Table A-45. Libraries Used by Graduate Students Ranked by Frequency of Use

Appendix B Table B- 1. Off-Campus Questionnaire Response

Table B- 2. Differences in Assignments by Faculty to Off-Campus and On-Campus Students by School

Table B- 3. Off Campus: Tailoring of Reading Assignments to Materials Available Locally by School

Table B- 4. Off Campus: Tailoring of Reading Assignments to Materials Available Locally by Field of Specialization

Table B- 5. Additional Library Resources Available for Specific Courses off Campus by School

Appendix B Table B- 6. Proportion of Faculty Who Personally Carry Library Materials to Class for Loan to Students by School

Table B- 7. Future Reliance on Library Resources for Off-Campus Students by School

Table B- 8. Off-Campus Teaching Locations by University

Appendix C Table C- 1. Highest Degree Held by Level of Teaching

Table C- 2. Percent of Teachers Engaged in Graduate Work for an Advanced Degree by Level of Teaching

Table C- 3. Percent of Teachers Engaged in Graduate Work for an Advanced Degree by Geographic District

Table C- 4. Institutions at Which Teachers Are Currently Working for a Graduate Degree

Table C- 5. Percent of Teachers Engaged in Research Other Than for a Degree by Geographic District

Table C- 6. Length of Service by Level of Teaching

Table C- 7. Libraries Used by Teachers

Table C- 8. Adequacy of All Types of Library Used for Professional Needs of Teachers (Percent)

Table C- 9. Elementary and Secondary Teachers: Adequacy of Individual Libraries Used

Table C-10. Frequency of Use of Libraries by Teachers

Table C-11. Teachers: Number and Percentage of Library Users from Each District

Table C-12. Teachers: Number and Percentage in Each District Using Selected Libraries

Appendix D Table D- 1. First Choice Order of Rank of Sources of Information for Business Executives by Size of Company Based on Number of Employees

Table D- 2. Percent of Companies Having Libraries by Number of Employees

Table D- 3. Percent of Companies Having Libraries Reported by Geographic Location

Table D- 4. Number Selecting Most Important Type of Library by Geographic District

Table D- 5. Frequency of Use of Company Libraries by Size of Company Based on Number of Employees

Table D- 6. Frequency of Use of Libraries (Other Than Company Library)

Table D- 7. Adequacy of Company Libraries by Size of Company Based on Number of Employees

Appendix E Questionnaires

INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of a statewide survey of reference and research library resources and needs in Michigan undertaken during the first six months of 1966.

Two broad objectives were established for this survey, namely:

1. to determine the extent and nature of the unmet needs, present and future, of major categories of users of reference and research library resources; and
2. to propose adequate and practical measures to meet such needs as are uncovered.

The first of these objectives is treated in Chapters I through IV and the second in Part Two.

In the Spring of 1965 a short preliminary study of reference and research library resources and needs in Michigan was prepared by Nelson Associates for the Governor's Interdepartmental Resource Development Committee, the Michigan Department of Economic Expansion, and the Michigan State Library. The report of this preliminary study entitled Suggested Guidelines for a Comprehensive Survey of Reference and Research Library Cooperation in Michigan was submitted to the three sponsoring organizations in April 1965 and was discussed by members of these organizations and other concerned persons in the state. Following the guidelines suggested, the Michigan State Board for Libraries, working through the Michigan State Library, authorized a more comprehensive study.

The earlier report indicates that only a limited amount of data was then available on many aspects of reference and research library needs in Michigan. A major portion of the present survey has consisted of a data collection effort to supply substantial additional information.

A three-part program of data collection was undertaken. First, four questionnaires were prepared and sent to four principal groups of users of reference and research library resources to assess their needs and determine their patterns of use of these resources.

The four groups were (1) all faculty members of four-year public and private institutions of higher learning in Michigan, (2) all teachers of off-campus university courses from the nine public universities and colleges offering such programs, (3) a sample of public elementary and secondary school teachers, and (4) a sample of manufacturing executives.

A second part of the data collection program consisted of interviews. Included in these interviews were selected librarians, faculty members, off-campus program directors, and administrators of ten public and five private universities and colleges in all parts of the state. In addition, eighteen selected federal, state, and local government officials (other than personnel of public libraries) were interviewed to determine their needs for and uses of reference and research library materials. The earlier study had shown some use of out-of-state library resources especially by individuals in the southwestern area of Michigan; to investigate this matter further interviews were also held with the directors or other senior administrators of the Center for Research Libraries and the John Crerar Library in Chicago, and the libraries of Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Notre Dame.

The third part of the data collection program consisted of the sampling of interlibrary loan slips and non-registered borrowers' cards from selected major libraries in the state and also the analysis of existing information from earlier studies and reports of individual libraries.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to all those who gave generously of their time to complete questionnaires and to be interviewed. Throughout the study an advisory group of public and university librarians, university administrators, and representatives of major special libraries gave valuable advice and guidance. Their names appear on a preceding page. Special thanks are due to Mr. Lawson Shaw and his staff at the machine records unit of the Michigan State Library for their machine tabulation of the questionnaires and computer preparation of tables which provided the data for most of the tables used in this report.

PART ONE

REFERENCE AND RESEARCH NEEDS AND PATTERNS OF LIBRARY USE AMONG MAJOR PATRON GROUPS

Chapter I

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Faculties and students at the graduate and undergraduate levels in the colleges and universities undoubtedly make up the largest group of users of reference and research library resources. To determine the library needs and current patterns of use by this group in Michigan, two methods were used in this study. First, questionnaires were distributed to all faculty members of four-year colleges; this group also included those administrators and graduate assistants with teaching and research responsibilities. Second, interviews were held on each of ten public university and college campuses and at five private colleges; the persons interviewed were selected from the faculty, administrators, and librarians.

The faculty questionnaire was distributed to a total of 14, 969 persons at 44 colleges and universities; an effort was made to reach every faculty member on every four-year campus in the state. Usable replies were received from 4, 877 (32. 6%). The percentage of returns ranged widely by college from a low of 2. 3% to a high of 73. 8% (both of these extremes were registered by relatively small liberal arts colleges). The three largest state universities and the largest private university, with responses ranging from 28. 2% to 32. 8%, were closely clustered around the overall figure. (See Table A-1.[1])

The questionnaire is divided into three parts. Part I, to be completed by all respondents, is designed to determine faculty professional library needs. Part II, to be answered only by those teaching undergraduates, is aimed at determining undergraduate students' library needs. Part III, to be completed only by those faculty members supervising graduate courses or research, considers the graduate students' library needs. A copy of this questionnaire appears in Appendix E as Exhibit 1.

---

[1] Tables with letter prefixes are found in the appendix with the corresponding letter.

I. FACULTY LIBRARY NEEDS

Characteristics

The respondents to the faculty questionnaire represent a wide cross section of academic fields and are widely distributed by academic rank and by length of service at their present institutions. The academic fields are grouped together into major academic areas; the distribution of respondents is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

AREA OF SPECIALIZATION

Humanities	22.2%
Social sciences	30.8
Biological sciences	19.3
Physical sciences	23.3
Combination of more than one area	2.8
No answer	1.6
	100.0%

Tables 2 and 3 give the percentage distribution by rank and by length of service at the present institution.

Table 2

ACADEMIC RANK

Full professor	22.0%
Associate professor	18.5
Assistant professor	24.1
Instructor (lecturer)	15.0
Research associate	3.8
Graduate assistant	10.5
Other	4.7
No answer	0.8
	100.0%

Table 3

LENGTH OF SERVICE AT PRESENT INSTITUTION

One year or less	19.2%
Over 1 year to 3 years	25.4
Over 3 years to 5 years	12.6
Over 5 years to 10 years	16.4
Over 10 years	25.3
No answer	1.1
	100.0%

Comprehensive data on a statewide basis are not available showing the actual distribution of college faculty members according to the above three characteristics; data on faculty rank, however, are available for 1962-63 and they show a close correspondence to the distribution of the responses (see Appendix A).

A common pattern in American higher education is the development of the faculty member as both teacher and researcher. To a substantial degree this pattern is being carried out by Michigan college and university faculty members. Of those replying to the faculty questionnaire 74.4% said they were engaged in research at the present time. Of those who said they were so engaged 70.5% said their research was not for a degree. This means that more than half (52.4%) of the total respondents was engaged in research not related to graduate degree work. Of those who were doing research for a degree 68.7% were working for a doctorate, 22.3% for a master's, and 9.0% for some other degree.

The interviews on campuses throughout the state show that faculty research, especially that not related to degree work, leads to publication in many forms including books, chapters, articles, reviews, films and film strips, records and tapes, and others. While the amount of research work and number of publications vary from campus to campus because of many factors, these activities are taking place in all parts of the state.

Use of Libraries

To meet their needs both for instructional programs and for research projects, to what libraries do these faculty members turn? The most frequently used library, far out-distancing all others, regardless of its size or adequacy, is the on-site campus library. Use of the campus library at least once a week or more is indicated by 69.5% while less than 1% say they never use their campus library. The second most frequently used library, but ranking substantially below the first, is the Detroit Public Library. Of the total respondents 4% indicate use once a week or more; thus the respondents alone include about 200 faculty members using the Detroit Public Library at least weekly; if they are typical of the total faculty population in the state, as many as 600 use this library at least weekly. Table 4 shows the frequency of use of the campus library, the three largest state university libraries, and the Michigan State Library as well as the Detroit Public. (See also Tables A-8 and A-9.) Because of the nature of the question it seems probable that the large number of "No Answer" tallies can be assumed to belong in the "Never" or "Infrequently" columns.

Almost every library in the state may be used at some time or other for some professional purpose by a faculty member. However, when asked to list other libraries used, only 16 libraries out of the hundreds of public, school, college, and special libraries in the state are listed by as many as 25 respondents. These 16 include four college libraries, 11 public libraries, and one private business library. Only three of these (Ann Arbor Public, Kalamazoo Public, and East Lansing Public) are listed by more than 100 respondents. (See Table A-12.)

Table 4

FREQUENCY OF USE OF MAJOR MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Library	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	Never	No Answer	Total
Campus Library	39.2%	30.3%	17.9%	10.0%	0.9%	1.7%	100.0%
University of Michigan	0.7	1.0	4.8	24.6	30.4	38.5	
Michigan State University	0.1	0.3	1.2	9.4	45.0	44.0	
Wayne State University	0.5	0.6	1.8	8.9	52.9	35.3	
Detroit Public Library	1.4	2.6	6.8	15.2	51.7	22.4	
Michigan State Library	0.1	0.3	1.6	14.2	59.4	24.4	

When asked which library of all those used by the respondent is the most important for his needs, 84.4% list the campus library.

Second and third listed, but much lower, are the University of Michigan Library at Ann Arbor (3. 6%) and the Detroit Public Library (1. 4%). All others are listed by less than 1%. With very few exceptions this high rank for the campus library applies to big universities and small colleges, regardless of location in the state, to all academic areas, and to faculty engaged in research or not so engaged. The second and third rank varies slightly by academic field. (See Tables A-2, A-3, and A-4.)

The most important exception to this general pattern is Eastern Michigan University where 55. 4% list the most important library as the campus library and 30. 5% specify the University of Michigan. This situation at Eastern Michigan University may be somewhat altered in the near future when the new library is completed and opened for service.

With the significance of the role of the campus library established by the judgment of its great importance to meet faculty professional needs and by the high frequency of use, the adequacy of that library as judged by its faculty users becomes of great importance also. Table 5 shows the overall opinion of the faculty respondents on the adequacy of the campus library for their own fields of specialization. From the table it can be seen that 57. 8% judge the campus library to be good or very good for their own field of specialization. (See also Table A-5.) Over 40% judge their campus libraries to be only "fair" or "poor."

Table 5

GENERAL ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY —
ALL RESPONDENTS

Very good	19.4%
Good	38.4
Fair	29.4
Poor	11.0
No answer	1.8

If one examines the responses from the eight state colleges and universities other than the University of Michigan, Michigan State and Wayne State, however, they reveal that 50% or more of the faculty members in each institution rate their campus libraries as only fair or poor with respect to adequacy in their fields of specialization. (Table A-5)

Tables 6 and 7 show this judgment according to academic area and to present research activities respectively. The faculties in the biological and physical sciences generally estimate the adequacy of the campus library higher than those in the social sciences and humanities, and in combined fields. Those respondents who are engaged in research for a degree give the campus library lower ratings than do those who are doing research not related to a degree or those not engaged in research.

Table 6

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC AREA

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Humanities	15.2%	36.2%	32.7%	14.0%	1.9%	100.0%
Social sciences	18.5	36.4	32.1	11.7	1.3	
Biological sciences	27.4	42.1	20.7	9.3	0.5	
Physical sciences	20.3	41.9	28.4	8.2	1.2	
All combinations	15.9	36.2	34.8	11.6	1.4	

Table 7

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY BY PRESENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Research for doctorate	13.4%	36.7%	32.8%	15.7%	1.4%	100.0%
Research for master's	7.6	36.4	40.3	15.7	0	
Research but not for degree	23.7	38.2	26.7	10.5	0.9	
Research but not specified	29.2	34.4	23.9	11.5	1.0	
Not engaged in research	16.8	42.7	30.0	8.1	2.4	

Two other factors seem to affect the judgment of adequacy of the campus library. In general the higher the academic rank of the respondent and the longer he has served in his present institution the higher the rating he gives to his campus library. (See Tables A-6 and A-7.)

Although the campus library fills a major need for faculty personnel, it has been noted above that some use, even though small compared to the campus library, is made of other libraries throughout Michigan. Table 8 shows in rank order the reasons given for using libraries other than the home campus library.

Table 8

MAIN REASONS FOR USING LIBRARIES OTHER THAN CAMPUS LIBRARY

Reason	Percent of Total Respondents
Depth of the specialized collection	38.5%
General breadth of the collection	26.7
Conveniently located	25.2
Broader selection of periodicals	19.2
Quality of reference service	10.0
Convenient hours	8.9
Stack privileges	8.5
Liberal loan policies	7.9
Comfortable facilities	6.2
Availability of government documents	5.8
Material not available in own library	2.5
Special or unique materials	0.8
"Easy to use"	0.4
Personnel more competent	0.3
All others	1.0

It is noteworthy that three of the top four reasons given for using other libraries relate to the quality of the collections available.

Almost all college and university libraries in the United States (and Michigan is no exception) extend the courtesy of use of their resources to qualified scholars and other specified users. In some cases, this use by "outsiders" is limited to certain unique resources and to certain categories of users. In others, this courtesy is more widely extended to any citizen who may have a legitimate reason for using the library's resources. These users may receive a special card which defines the conditions under which they can use the library and specifies the period of time during which it can be used. These "non-registered borrowers' cards" provide an additional source of data on use of libraries by other than "home constituents." Table 9 shows the number and distribution outstanding of non-registered borrowers' cards for four universities in Michigan during the week of March 14-18, 1966. The figures in Table 9 are based on the definition of this service used by each university itself and this definition does not always include all students from other institutions who use the library's materials and services. (For example, Wayne State University and the University of Detroit have a reciprocal agreement permitting students and faculty from each university to use the libraries of both on presentation of proper identification cards from their own school. These library users are not listed as non-registered borrowers and are not included in the figures in this table. Also, many schools use this same card for their own students and faculty who for some reason (e. g., loss or theft) may not have possession of their own regular identification cards for an extended period of time; the special non-registered borrower's card may be used until a new identification card is issued.)

Non-registered borrowers' cards do not by themselves provide a true measure of library use by outsiders. Nor does the record of interlibrary loans (discussed later in this chapter) complete the picture. A very substantial part of library use, as any regular patron, librarian or observer will testify, does not result in any record or transaction; it consists of in-library use of materials and services not resulting in the removal of any material. In fact it is this great volume of unrecorded activity that largely accounts for the necessity of employing questionnaires such as were distributed for the present study.

Although the campus library is ranked generally as the most important and most frequently used by the faculty, this does not mean, of course, that they necessarily regard it as possessing the best collection of material in the state in their own fields of specialization. Slightly more than half of the respondents named the University of Michigan Library when asked which library has the best collection. Table 10 shows the distribution of the total respondents on this question. Almost one-third of the respondents indicate they do not know or gave no answer.

Table 9

NON-REGISTERED BORROWERS' CARDS SUMMARY
WEEK OF MARCH 14-18, 1966

Category of Card Holder	University of Michigan		Michigan State University		Wayne State University		University of Detroit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Members of the University's Own Family								
Students	39	6.5%	47	4.5%	134	35.9%	0	0
Student family	0	0	26	2.5	0	0	0	0
Faculty	98	16.4	34	3.3	54	14.5	2	10.0%
Faculty family	37	6.2	46	4.4	12	3.2	0	0
Subtotal	174	29.1%	153	14.7%	200	53.6%	2	10.0%
Others from Michigan								
Students from other Michigan colleges and universities	11	1.8%	361	34.9%	4	1.1%	1	5.0%
Faculty from other Michigan colleges and universities	220	36.8	48	4.6	26	7.0	3	15.0
Teachers and other educators	10	1.7	94	9.1	25	6.7	6	30.0
Government officials and employees	51	8.5	94	9.1	14	3.8	0	0
Business and industrial	14	2.4	87	8.4	50	13.4	5	25.0
Clergy	13	2.2	8	0.8	3	0.8	1	5.0
Writers	1	0.2	6	0.6	3	0.8	0	0
Other professional	23	3.8	32	3.1	2	0.5	0	0
Miscellaneous others	54	9.0	123	11.9	30	8.0	0	0
Subtotal	397	66.4%	853	82.5%	157	42.1%	16	80.0%
Out-of-State								
Students	1	0.2%	27	2.6%	1	0.3%	1	5.0%
Faculty	24	4.0	0	0	15	4.0	1	5.0
Miscellaneous	0	0	1	0.1	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	25	4.2%	28	2.7%	16	4.3%	2	10.0%
Unidentified	2	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	598	100.0%	1,034	100.0%*	373	100.0%	20	100.0%

---

* Total does not add due to rounding.

Table 10

BEST COLLECTION IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION

Library	Percent of Total Respondents
University of Michigan	51.8%
Michigan State University	7.2
Wayne State University	3.4
Detroit Public Library	1.3
Michigan State Library	0.5
University of Detroit	0.3
Personal libraries	0.2
All others (including campus libraries for other schools)	2.9
Don't know	16.3
No answer	16.0

This order of rank generally holds for all academic areas except for the humanities where the positions of Michigan State University and Wayne State University are reversed. (See Tables A-13 and A-14.)

Library Materials and Services

Faculty respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they used selected types of library materials in their fields of specialization. Table 11 shows the percentage replies for all respondents. For periodicals the response by academic division follows the general pattern with the biological sciences making most frequent use and the humanities making the least use, but the range between them is less than 3%. For monographs the most frequent user is the social sciences and again the humanities the least frequent with a separation of 14.4% between them. For government documents there is a wider range; again the social sciences are first and the humanities last with a separation of 48.9%. For manuscripts the social sciences are first and the physical sciences last with a gap of 13.1%, and for recordings and related materials the gap is 35.4% between the humanities (first) and the physical sciences (last). (See Table A-23.)

Table 11

USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

Type of Material	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total
Periodicals, serials, journals	80.4%	17.4%	0.7%	1.5%	100.0%
Monographs	36.6	43.6	11.0	8.8	
Government documents	19.5	45.1	24.1	11.3	
Manuscripts	9.1	44.9	33.8	12.2	
Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audio-visual materials	10.5	31.8	47.4	10.3	

The faculty were also asked to report the frequency of their use of selected library services provided by campus libraries and to evaluate, in general terms, the adequacy of these services. Table 12 shows the replies for frequency and judgment of adequacy for interlibrary loans, Xerox or other photoduplication, and for microfilm readers/printers. (See Tables A-15 through A-22.) The data reveal, among other things, that respondents rely heavily on copying services (over 75% indicating often or occasional use); that interlibrary loan is used often by relatively few but at least occasionally by nearly 54%; and that almost precisely half of the respondents never use microfilm readers or printers.

Satisfaction with the adequacy of these services is generally rather high, ranging from 58. 6% (Xerox or photoduplication) to 35. 1% (microfilm readers/printers) indicating that the services are very good or good. (A significant percentage of respondents indicate they don't know how adequate the services are, but these are largely accounted for by those not using the services.)

Those who answered that the service is either fair or poor were asked to list what they think are the major deficiencies of the service. For interlibrary loans, more than half (53. 9%) indicate that the major deficiency is slowness of service. For photoduplication services no one major deficiency in service stands out so clearly. The one most often listed (23. 8%) is the need to wait to use the machines; close behind is the cost of photoduplication, listed by 22. 8%. The third and fourth ranked deficiences, like the first, concern limitations on the equipment — restricted access to machines (11. 6%), and lack of

Table 12

FREQUENCY OF USE AND ADEQUACY OF SELECTED LIBRARY SERVICES

	Frequency					Adequacy						
	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Interlibrary loans	9.7%	53.8%	33.6%	2.9%	100.0%	14.9%	31.2%	11.5%	5.0%	29.2%	8.2%	100.0%
Xerox or photo-duplication	29.1	48.2	18.8	3.9	100.0	21.9	36.7	11.5	7.6	14.3	8.0	100.0
Microfilm readers/ printers	4.8	40.4	49.9	4.9	100.0	7.7	27.4	6.2	4.1	33.6	21.0	100.0

satisfactory equipment (10. 6%). For microfilm readers/printers a similar pattern emerges. The principal deficiencies in service and the percentages listing them are: (1) have to wait to use machines — 20. 9%; (2) inadequate facilities other than the machines themselves — 15. 5%; (3) inadequate collection of films — 13. 1%; and (4) lack of any or of satisfactory equipment — 12. 5%.

Most faculty members apparently rely mainly on themselves most of the time for locating information in their campus libraries. Of the total respondents, more than two-thirds (68. 9%) say they rely occasionally on the campus library staff for professional assistance in locating information while only 17. 3% say they do so often. More than one out of nine (11. 7%) indicate they never rely on the library staff.

In carrying out their professional responsibilities for research and teaching almost two-thirds of the faculty (66. 3%) feel it is essential to have free access to the library stacks and an additional 25. 9% feel it is worthwhile. Only 6. 5% believe such free access is incidental to their work. (See Tables A-10 and A-11.)

Out-of-State Libraries

The reference and research resources of libraries outside the state of Michigan can sometimes be tapped when needed by users in Michigan. These out-of-state resources may be borrowed on interlibrary loan, photocopies may be requested, or personal visits may be made to use the facilities at the libraries themselves. All of these methods have been used by Michigan scholars from all parts of the state, but the total use of out-of-state library resources is not large. In the course of the present study information on interlibrary loan transactions was obtained directly from selected libraries; the data reveal a variety of patterns. For example, a major portion of the University of Michigan's interlibrary loan transactions (in a one-year period 47. 9% of those loaned and 56. 8% of those borrowed) was conducted with out-of-state colleges and universities. (See Table 13.) Another example in recent years is Andrews University which borrows from the nearby University of Notre Dame. While the total number of these transactions is not large for either school, it might be noted that two-thirds of Notre Dame's interlibrary loans to Michigan schools in one recent year went to Andrews University alone.

The respondents to the faculty questionnaire were asked to what extent they make personal visits to out-of-state libraries. Table 14 shows the replies to this question. Besides the libraries listed on the

Table 13

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERLIBRARY LOANS AND PHOTODUPLICATION REQUESTS FOR SELECTED MICHIGAN LIBRARIES (PERCENT OF TOTAL TRANSACTIONS)

	University of Michigan		Wayne State University		University of Detroit		Detroit Public Library	
	Loaned	Borrowed	Loaned	Borrowed	Loaned	Borrowed	Loaned	Borrowed
Educational Institutions								
Michigan colleges and universities	14.1%	2.1%	3.5%	16.1%	14.5%	48.6%	3.2%	13.6%
Michigan schools and boards of education	1.0	0	0.2	*	7.0	0	0.7	0.4
Out-of-state	47.9	56.8	5.0	68.1	21.9	15.8	4.0	43.4
Public Libraries								
Detroit Public Library	0.1	1.2	0.9	0.5	0	13.8	n.a.	n.a.
Michigan State Library	0.2	1.1	0.2	*	0	0	2.2	1.2
Others	3.0	3.3	0.2	3.8	2.9	0.6	4.6	7.0
Government Agencies								
U.S. government	1.4	23.5	1.1	10.2	0.4	14.7	1.5	15.1
Michigan state agencies	*	0	0.1	0.5	0	0	*	0
Michigan local (other than schools and boards of education)	0	0	1.3	*	0	0	0.3	0
Others	0.5	0	0	0	0	3.1	0.3	0
Special Libraries								
Michigan hospitals and other medical	0.8	*	51.7	0.3	2.1	0	0.9	1.6
Michigan business and industry	17.9	0.5	35.5	0.3	51.2	3.4	79.1	8.9
Others	12.8	11.3	0.2	0	0	0	3.3	8.9
Total (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Items**	18,508	1,492	10,874	1,491	242	354	8,363	258

---

* Less than 0.1%.

** The total number of items is for a one-year period. In the case of the items loaned by the University of Michigan we were provided the figures for an eight-month period and projected these figures for an additional four-month period to get the annual total. For the Detroit Public Library we received a report of loans to libraries in Detroit, but outside the public library system for a six-month period; this figure was doubled to get the annual figure and was added to the annual total of interlibrary loans to libraries outside Detroit for the total loans reported in this table. All other totals are annual totals reported by each library.

n.a. - not applicable

Table 14

USE OF OUT-OF-STATE LIBRARIES

	At Least Once a Month	Several Times a Year	Rarely	Never	No Answer	Total**
University of Chicago	*	1.4%	7.4%	60.7%	30.4%	100.0%
Northwestern University	*	0.4	2.7	64.5	32.3	
John Crerar Library	*	0.5	3.9	63.4	32.1	
Center for Research Libraries	0	0.2	1.7	64.9	33.1	
Notre Dame University	0.1%	0.7	2.4	63.5	33.3	

---

* Less than 0.05%.

** May not add due to rounding.

table the only libraries to receive any mention by as many as 1% of the respondents were the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the Newberry Library in Chicago, and Harvard's Library. While there is no measurement here of the importance of any of these visits to a particular research project, clearly the frequency of personal visits to out-of-state libraries is very small. The absolute numbers are not insignificant, however; in the case of the University of Chicago the 1.4% who visit its library several times a year represents 68 of the respondents; if the respondent group is representative of the total population there are over 200 Michigan faculty members using the Chicago Library several times a year.

II. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' LIBRARY NEEDS

Part II of the faculty questionnaire was designed for those faculty members who teach undergraduates. Of the total usable responses in Part I, 3,649 or about three-fourths (74.8%) answered Part II, and the tables relevant to this section are based upon that number of responses.

The faculty were asked to evaluate the adequacy of the campus library in meeting undergraduate student needs in terms of four factors. Table 15 shows their responses. More than 60% consider the campus library either good or very good with respect to depth of collections in the fields they teach and also with respect to general breadth of collection. (See Tables A-24 and A-25.) Those teaching biological and physical sciences generally rate the depth of special collections a little higher than do those teaching the humanities and social sciences. (See Table A-27.)

Table 15

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY
FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Depth of collection in the field you teach	19.3%	42.0%	27.0%	7.7%	2.0%	100.0%
General breadth of collection	19.4	44.7	27.2	5.8	2.9	
Availability of multiple copies	5.2	21.2	38.3	31.4	3.9	
Availability of seating space	10.7	33.0	30.4	21.2	4.7	

The judgment of adequacy applied to the availability of multiple copies and of seating space is much less favorable. Only slightly more than one-quarter (26.4%) think the availability of multiple copies is very good or good and less than half (43.7%) rate seating space availability in those two categories. (See Tables A-26 and A-28.)

The importance of the campus library was noted above in Part I and is again shown in the answers by the faculty to the question of whether or not they tailor their course reading lists to materials available in the campus library. The answers are divided as follows: Yes — 57.2%; No — 19%; Don't use reading lists — 21.1%; and No answer — 2.7%. Of the well over half that replied yes — that they do tailor their reading lists to campus library materials — more than four out of five indicate that this does restrict them to some extent at least in compiling reading lists. The percentages are: no restriction at all — 17.4%; somewhat restrictive — 57.9%; significantly restrictive — 19.3%; severely restrictive — 4.2%. Except for the physical sciences where a large number of those responding do not use reading lists, the academic areas generally conform to this pattern, and even in the physical sciences three out of four of those who do tailor their reading lists feel this restricts them to some extent. (See Tables A-30 and A-31.)

To a very great extent faculty members expect their undergraduate students to rely on the campus library for materials needed for course work. Only 15.4% said they expect their students to use library resources other than the campus library for course work. This pattern applies generally throughout the state with one exception. In the Detroit area slightly more than a quarter of the faculty at both public and private universities indicate that they do expect their students to use off-campus libraries for course work. This probably reflects the existence of several college and large public libraries within ordinary commuting distances in the Detroit area.

When it comes to term papers and other special assignments a larger percentage, but still a minority, of faculty expect their students to use resources other than the campus library. For this kind of work 33.3% say they do expect their students to use other resources. There is considerably more variation by college or university in response to this question than there is to the previous one. (See Tables A-32 and A-33.)

The faculty were asked what libraries, to their knowledge, other than the campus library are used by their undergraduate students and were asked to list them in descending order of frequency of use. A large number of libraries was listed. The first four libraries listed as most frequently used in order were the Detroit Public Library, the University of Michigan Library, the Michigan State Library, and the Wayne State University Library. The first four libraries listed as second most frequently used were the Detroit Public Library, Wayne State University, the University of Michigan, and the Michigan State University Library. The first four libraries listed as third most frequently used were the Detroit Public Library, the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Michigan State University. (See Table A-29.)

Finally, faculty were asked to indicate on the basis of their teaching plans what reliance their undergraduate students would have to place in the future on selected types of library materials. Table 16 shows their replies, and again the importance of periodicals, serials, and journals is clearly shown. While the same pattern is generally followed by academic area there is some variation, especially concerning government documents, manuscripts, and audio-visual materials. With respect to the first two, the social sciences place greater emphasis while the humanities and physical sciences place less. Concerning the audio-visual materials, the humanities place the most emphasis for future need while the physical sciences place the least. (See Table A-34.)

Table 16

FUTURE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY MATERIAL NEEDS

	More	Same	Less	No Need Now or in Future	No Answer	Total
Periodicals, serials, journals	55.7%	35.8%	1.0%	4.5%	3.0%	100.0%
Monographs	24.5	48.8	2.4	14.8	9.5	
Government documents	17.0	40.6	2.1	28.1	12.2	
Manuscripts	9.4	40.4	3.1	33.3	13.8	
Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audio-visual materials	30.4	29.7	1.8	26.9	11.2	

III. GRADUATE STUDENTS' LIBRARY NEEDS

Part III of the questionnaire was designed to obtain the views of faculty members on the library needs of graduate students. Only those teaching graduate classes or supervising graduate research were asked to reply to this portion of the questionnaire. Of the total respondents (4,877), this section was answered by 2,367 or 48.5%. The tables for this part are based on that total of responses.

The faculty were asked to evaluate the adequacy of the campus library for meeting the overall needs of their graduate students in three respects. Table 17 shows the distribution of the total number of responses to this question. On an overall basis the majority of faculty considers the depth and breadth of their campus library collections to be good or very good. Yet 39.2% rate the campus library only fair or poor with respect to depth of collection and 36.2% so rate it with respect to general breadth. For graduate students, like undergraduate students, the unavailability of multiple copies seems to be a serious deficiency in campus libraries. (See Tables A-35, A-36, and A-37.)

Table 17

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Depth of collection in fields you teach	22.6%	36.7%	28.9%	10.4%	1.5%	100.0%
General breadth of collection	22.9	39.3	27.2	9.0	1.6	
Availability of multiple copies	5.6	22.6	38.0	30.2	3.6	

There is considerable variation in responses by school although a pattern is apparent. The three large public universities with large graduate programs and the private universities and colleges, which usually have limited graduate programs, generally conform to the total picture. However the regional and newer public universities and colleges, some of which are in the process of expanding or planning expansion of graduate programs, are rated substantially below the overall figures. There is also considerable variation by academic field in evaluating the campus library. (See Table A-38.)

More than half (55.8%) of the graduate faculty report that they tailor the reading lists for their courses and seminars to materials available in the campus library; 31.3% say they do not; and 9.9% say they do not use reading lists. Of those who tailor their reading lists, almost four out of five (again a pattern similar to the undergraduate) indicate that this restricts them to some extent in compiling reading lists. The figures are: 5.8% severely, 20.6% significantly, 52.3% somewhat, 19.9% not at all, and 1.4% no answer. There is a wide range by academic field. (See Tables A-41 and A-42.)

The same questions applied to the selection of research and thesis topics give substantially different results. Only 24.6% say they tailor reading lists for these assignments to the campus library and 15.5% report they do not use reading lists for this work. Of those who do tailor reading lists, almost the same percentage (77.7%), however, say that such tailoring restricts them in compiling their lists. Again there is a wide range by academic field. (See Tables A-43 and A-44.)

Faculty members were asked if they expect their graduate students to use library resources other than the campus for certain types of assignments. Table 18 gives the distribution of replies to this question for the total number of respondents.

Table 18

USE OF OTHER THAN CAMPUS LIBRARY FOR SELECTED TYPES OF ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Course and seminar work	35.6%	58.9%	5.5%	100.0%
Term papers and other special assignments	44.0	50.0	6.0	
Theses and dissertations	64.4	25.5	10.1	

While the percentage rises as the type of assignment involves more extended research materials and techniques, it is only for theses and dissertations that more than half expect their students to use libraries other than the campus library. Again there is considerable variation by academic field, but these figures once more point up the general importance of the campus library. (See Tables A-39 and A-40.)

The faculty were asked to list, in order by frequency of use, libraries other than the campus libraries which, to their knowledge, are used by their graduate students. The first three libraries listed as most frequently used are the University of Michigan, the Detroit Public Library, and Wayne State University. All out-of-state libraries taken together give a total greater than Wayne State and less than the Detroit Public Library. (See Table A-45.)

Table 19 shows the distribution of the total response to the question concerning future graduate student reliance on selected types of library materials on the basis of the teaching plans of the graduate faculty. Again, as shown on Parts I and II of the questionnaire, heaviest reliance is placed on periodicals, serials, and journals. While there is some variation by academic field, in all fields more than half the respondents indicate that they will place more reliance on this type of material in the future than they do at present.

Table 19

FUTURE GRADUATE STUDENT NEEDS
FOR SELECTED LIBRARY MATERIALS

Material	More	Same	Less	No Need Now or in Future	No Answer	Total
Periodicals, serials, journals	63.3%	31.5%	0.4%	0.3%	4.5%	100.0%
Monographs	41.1	47.0	1.4	2.9	7.6	
Government documents	28.9	42.9	1.8	15.4	11.0	
Manuscripts	22.9	44.6	2.4	18.0	11.9	
Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audio-visual materials	25.8	31.8	1.4	27.5	13.4	

MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings of the survey with respect to patterns of use and library needs at Michigan colleges and universities are given below.

1. The campus library is judged by faculty members to be the most frequently used library by both faculty and students regardless of the type of institution, the adequacy of its library or its proximity to other libraries.

2. The campus library is judged by faculty members to be the most important library to faculty and students.

   a. For course work, seminars, and special assignments, both undergraduates and graduates are expected mainly to use the campus libraries and are not expected to use other libraries.

   b. Only in the preparation of theses and dissertations does a majority of faculty expect its graduate students to use libraries other than the campus library.

   c. Except for reading lists prepared for theses and dissertations, more than half the faculty tailors its reading lists to materials available in the campus library, and of those who do tailor their reading lists, four out of five feel this restricts their compilation of reading lists to some degree.

3. After the campus library, the Detroit Public Library, in the opinion of faculty members, is the most frequently used library for faculty and undergraduates and the second most frequently used by graduate students. The University of Michigan Library is the most frequently used library by graduate students, after the campus library, and the second most frequently used by faculty and undergraduates.

4. After the campus library, the University of Michigan Library is considered by college faculty throughout the state to be the most important library for meeting their professional needs and the Detroit Public Library is considered the next most important.

5. Slightly more than half of the faculty respondents believe the University of Michigan has the best library collection in their field of specialization in the state, far outranking all other libraries, whether in the humanities, social sciences, biological sciences or physical sciences.

6. Although an important source of materials for thesis and dissertation writers, out-of-state libraries do not play a large role in the total supply of Michigan reference and research needs, and personal visits to use such libraries are very limited.

7. A majority of faculty judge the adequacy of their campus library as good or very good. However in the eight state colleges and universities other than the University of Michigan, Wayne State and Michigan State, 50% or more of the faculty members responding from each institution consider their campus libraries only fair or poor with respect to adequacy in their fields of specialization. Judgment of adequacy also varies by academic rank and length of service. Generally, the higher the academic rank of a faculty member and the longer his service at the institution, the higher is the rating he gives the campus library.

8. The main reasons for using libraries other than the campus library relate to the collections themselves. Three of the four main reasons (depth of special collection, breadth of general collection, and broader selection of periodicals) are concerned with the collections. The fourth main reason is the convenience of location.

9. The greatest inadequacy of the campus library at both undergraduate and graduate student levels, according to the faculty, is the limited availability of multiple copies of much used books and other materials.

10. The type of library material most in demand currently is periodicals, serials, journals, and similar items. In the future, the faculty expects to place still greater reliance on this category of material for both its undergraduate and graduate students.

11. Almost two-thirds of the faculty use interlibrary loans at least occasionally, but less than half consider the service good or very good. The major criticism is slowness of the service.

12. More than three-fourths of the faculty use photoduplication services at least occasionally, but only 59% consider it good or very good. The major criticisms concern the equipment itself, access to the equipment, and the costs of these services.

13. Less than half of the faculty use microfilm/printer equipment even occasionally and only a little more than one-third consider the service good or very good. The major criticisms concern the inadequacies of the equipment, of the film collections, and of the facilities other than the equipment.

14. A large portion of the faculty relies mainly on itself most of the time to locate information in the library. Only 17.3% claim they often call for professional library assistance to locate information.

Chapter II

FACULTY AND STUDENTS IN OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

One group of college and university faculty members functioning within a unique setting, and therefore faced with unique opportunities and problems, is the group teaching courses off-campus in extension or field service programs. These programs may be part of well established, regularly ongoing extension centers or they may consist of occasional courses taught in a particular community to meet a specific need or request. The courses may be essentially the same credit courses as those taught on campus with the only difference being the remoteness of the teaching site or they may be non-credit courses of a special kind designed to meet the requests of a particular group. The length of the course, the requirements for admission and other aspects may vary considerably from established campus programs depending upon the circumstances. The course teachers may come from the regular university or college faculty or from among individuals especially chosen because of their special knowledge or skill and who may not be regular faculty members. All of these factors and others contribute to the special character of off-campus instructional programs.

Off-campus programs are increasing rapidly in enrollment. Given the increasing number of adults who wish to upgrade their education and skills and the growing number of young people just out of high school who wish to continue their education while working, often in their home towns, there is no reason to believe that off-campus centers of higher education will not continue to grow in numbers of students and importance.

In order to assess the library needs of off-campus students, a questionnaire was sent to the 1,220 teachers of off-campus courses at nine public universities and colleges in Michigan. The institutions chosen include all the public colleges and universities except Grand Valley State College and Oakland University which do not have off-campus programs at present. Of the total questionnaires sent usable replies were received from 406, or 33.3%. There were great variations among the nine schools in the number to whom questionnaires were sent, ranging from less than ten to more than 300 depending on the number of teachers employed in the off-campus program. The response rate also varied with the two smallest programs providing the outer limits of responses at 10% and 80%. (See Table B-1, Appendix B.)

Each off-campus program director was asked to provide a list of names of communities in which courses were being taught. A total of 166 communities was named. Of this total 119 had an off-campus program from one university, 33 had programs from two universities, 11 from three, and three from four. (See Table B-8.)

Overwhelmingly, the largest number of respondents (93.3%) teach credit courses; 5.4% indicate that they teach both credit and non-credit courses. Only 1% reply that they teach non-credit courses alone. Table 1 shows the distribution of the total responses by major academic division. The result is heavily weighted in the area labeled "professional." Response to other inquiries suggests that the largest category in the "professional" group is made of education courses.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION BY ACADEMIC AREA

Humanities	14.8%
Social sciences	20.2
Biological sciences	2.5
Physical sciences	4.6
Professional (business, engineering, education, etc.)	55.4
All combinations of two divisions or more	2.2
No answer	0.2
Total	100.0%*

---

* May not add due to rounding.

Comparison of Off-Campus and On-Campus Library Conditions

One of the oft-stated goals of universities offering the same courses off-campus as on-campus is to maintain the same standards and quality in the two programs so that the student will be equally well prepared when he completes terminal programs or transfers credits regardless of the campus or site at which he took his course work. A section of the questionnaire attempts to inquire into the comparative conditions as they relate to library resources. This section was to be answered only by those teachers who taught the same courses off campus and on campus for the same institution. Of the total respondents to the questionnaire, this section was answered by 70. 4%.

Of those who replied, slightly more than three-fifths (62. 2%) say that there are differences in the assignments made to their off-campus students and to their on-campus students. (See Table B-2.) With the exception of the physical sciences this general pattern is applicable to all academic areas. Table 2 shows the distribution by academic area.

Table 2

DIFFERENCES IN ASSIGNMENTS BY FACULTY
TO OFF-CAMPUS AND ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS

Academic Area	Yes	No
Humanities	64.6%	35.4%
Social sciences	64.7	35.3
Biological sciences	62.5	37.5
Physical sciences	37.5	62.5
Professional	63.0	37.0
All combinations	75.0	25.0

There may be many reasons for the differences in the assignments, but the present study is confined to library aspects. Accordingly those who answered in the affirmative were asked if the differences in assignments are due to differences in library resources. Of this group 8. 9% say the differences in assignments are entirely due to differences in library resources and a total of 84. 3% indicate that the differences in assignments are due to some extent to differences in library resources. Those who attributed the differences in assignment at least to some extent to differences in library resources were asked to compare selected library resources on campus and off campus. Table 3 shows the responses to this comparison. For these selected types of library resources the table clearly shows the inadequacies of

Table 3

SELECTED LIBRARY RESOURCES COMPARED ON-CAMPUS AND OFF-CAMPUS

	More Available Off Campus	Same	Less Available Off Campus	No Answer
General reference and background material	1.9%	4.9%	89.0%	3.9%
Multiple copies of important titles	3.9	7.9	82.9	5.3

	More Complete Off Campus	Same	Less Complete Off Campus	No Answer
Subject matter collections in the fields you teach	2.0%	1.3%	92.8%	3.9%

off-campus resources compared with on-campus resources in the judgment of the faculty members responding. Considering these differences in library resources, this group of teachers was asked how these factors taken together affect the achievements of their off-campus students. The replies are: adversely 71. 1%; favorably 2%; not at all 19. 7%; and 7. 2% no reply.

All the teachers who indicated that there are differences in assignments to their off-campus and on-campus students were asked if they use a text in their off-campus courses but not in their on-campus courses because of the difference in availability of library resources. The answers are: yes, 14. 6%; no, 77%; and 8. 4% no answer.

Despite the apparent shortage of available library resources for off-campus students, a majority of teachers (54. 3% of the total respondents) tailors its reading assignments in preparing off-campus course work to the materials available locally. This general pattern applies to all the universities and to all academic areas, again with the exception of the physical sciences, in which only 31. 6% say that they tailor reading lists to materials available locally. Although the actual number is small, 100% of those who teach only non-credit courses say they tailor their reading lists to local materials. (See Tables B-3 and B-4.)

Library Resources Available to Off-Campus Students

As mentioned above, there is a great variety of off-campus sites. Some classes are taught in permanent buildings occupied full-time by the extension center while others are held in schools or other community centers used on a part-time basis. In many of these centers there is only limited space for maintaining a permanent library collection; in some there is none. Of the total respondents slightly less than half (49.7%) state that a permanent library collection is located at their off-campus teaching site.

Of those who indicate that there is a permanent library collection at their off-campus teaching site, two-thirds (66.8%) judge its adequacy as fair or poor for the needs of their off-campus students. Some 23.3% consider it good and 6.4% think it very good (3.5% do not know or give no answer).

A large percentage of the teachers receive additional library materials for specific courses when taught off-campus. Of the total 66.3% say they do receive such materials and 30.8% say they do not, while the remainder give no reply. The main source of additional materials is their own university. Of those who receive these supplementary library materials 43.5% obtain them from the campus library and 31.6% get them through the extension or field services division of the university. Only 0.8% report receiving them from local public libraries and 1.1% from other agencies (20% name no agency and 3% say they do not know from what agency additional materials are received). (See Table B-5).

The off-campus faculty were asked to name what libraries, to their knowledge, other than the teaching site library, are used by their off-campus students. Of the total respondents 31.8% give no answer. The 68.2% that do answer list a total of 94 different libraries. Table 4 shows the distribution of the responses by major categories of libraries.

Table 4

TYPES OF LIBRARIES
USED BY OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS
OTHER THAN ON-SITE LIBRARY

Types of Library	Percent of Total Libraries Listed
Public	41.4%
Michigan colleges and universities	28.6
School libraries	8.1
Community colleges	6.0
Personal libraries	5.1
Business libraries	3.3
Michigan State Library	3.0
Out-of-state libraries	0.6
Total	100.0%

The individual libraries named by as many as ten respondents are, in descending order, Wayne State University, Detroit Public Library, Grand Rapids Public Library, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the Michigan State Library, and the Flint Public Library.

In addition to regular library resources and their personal libraries, off-campus students have at least one other source of library materials — their teachers. Of the total respondents almost two-thirds (63.3%) report personally carrying library books and materials to their off-campus courses to loan to students. (See Table B-6.) There is considerable variation by academic division in the response to this question. The highest percent carrying books to class is in the professional category (74.7%), almost three times that in the physical sciences category (26.3%) which is the lowest. In the biological sciences the percentage bringing library materials to class for loan to students is 40%, in the humanities 50%, and in the social sciences 53.7%.

If the current availability of library materials at off-campus centers is not completely satisfactory, future prospects are less hopeful unless steps are taken to remedy the present inadequacies. For, in response to a question about their plans to rely on library resources in the future, 34% say they will be more reliant in the future, 59.1% say the same, and only 3.2% indicate less reliance. (See Table B-7.) This pattern for the future is generally applicable to all academic divisions although less so in the biological sciences than elsewhere. The small number who teach non-credit courses only report future reliance on library materials to be the same as at present.

MAJOR FINDINGS

A summary of the major findings of the survey with respect to library needs and resources of off-campus students is given below.

1. More than three-fifths of the faculty members responding to the questionnaire who teach the same courses off campus as on campus for the same institution make different assignments to the two groups of students.

2. Of those who make different assignments more than four out of five attribute this difference entirely or in part to differences in library resources.

3. Despite the limited library resources more than half the off-campus faculty tailor their course work reading assignments to library materials available locally, and of those who do, 86.8% say that this restricts them to some extent in compiling reading lists.

4. Between 80% and 90% of the faculty who give different assignments report that general reference and background materials and multiple copies of important titles are less available off campus than on campus. More than 90% indicate that the subject matter collections in the fields they teach are less complete off campus.

5. More than 71% of the faculty group giving different assignments are of the opinion that the library limitations off campus affect the achievement of their off-campus students adversely.

6. 14.6% of faculty respondents turn to textbooks as a substitute for library resources off campus in cases where texts are not used in the same course on campus.

7. Off-campus library materials are provided from several sources. Slightly less than half the total respondents report permanent library collections maintained at their off-campus teaching sites. Almost two-thirds report that additional library materials are supplied for specific courses off campus; these additional materials come most often from the main university campus library or the extension or field services. In addition, more than three-fifths of the faculty report personally carrying books to their off-campus courses for loan to their students.

8. Aside from the on-site library, the libraries most often used by off-campus students are local public libraries with the Detroit, Grand Rapids and Flint libraries most often cited. The Michigan State Library is also frequently cited. A substantial number of students also use, according to their faculty, the libraries of Michigan colleges and universities led by Wayne State University, the University of Michigan, and Michigan State University.

9. More than 90% of the responding faculty of off-campus centers report that their teaching plans call for the same or greater reliance on library resources in the future.

Chapter III

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Michigan has more than 80,000 public elementary and secondary school teachers. Little is known about the reference and research needs of this major education leadership group after its members leave college and begin teaching. In order to get some information on the patterns of use of libraries to meet professional needs of elementary and secondary teachers and to obtain their assessment of library strengths and weaknesses, a questionnaire was sent to a sample of 2,500 elementary and secondary teachers chosen at random from a master list, prepared by the Education Department of the state of Michigan, of all public school teachers in the state. Of the total number of questionnaires sent out usable replies were received from 826 or 33.0%. (See Appendix C.)

Characteristics

The teachers who returned completed questionnaires were almost equally divided between elementary and secondary levels. Elementary teachers accounted for 46.7% of the total, secondary school teachers 47.9%, and those who taught at both levels were 2.8% of the total. A small percentage (2.6%) gave no answer. If the latter two categories are divided proportionately among the two groups, the response is calculated at 49.3% elementary and 50.7% secondary. This compares to independent estimates for the total of 55% elementary and 45% secondary.

Each of the teachers was asked to indicate in which of Michigan's 83 counties he taught. For purposes of this analysis, the 83 counties are grouped into ten districts. The counties assigned to each district are listed in Appendix C. Table 1 shows the response received by district. Short terms are used to identify the districts geographically.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT

	District	Percent of Total Responses
I.	Upper Peninsula	7.0%
II.	Northern Michigan	2.9
III.	Central Michigan	5.6
IV.	Grand Rapids-Muskegon area	5.7
V.	Flint-Saginaw area	7.9
VI.	Lansing area	6.2
VII.	Suburban Detroit area (counties other than Wayne)	19.2
VIII.	Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	11.6
IX.	Southeast Michigan (Jackson-Ann Arbor)	7.7
X.	Wayne County	25.5
	No answer	0.7
	Total	100.0%

Most of the teachers who replied have been teaching in the state of Michigan long enough to have some acquaintance with available reference and research resources. Many of them probably had their teacher preparation in the state as well. Of the respondents 44. 2% had been teaching in Michigan over ten years; 25. 7% over five years to ten years; 21. 3% over two years to five years; and only 8. 1% less than two years. (See Table C-6.)

None of the respondents holds a doctor's degree. A substantial number (40. 9%), however, hold the master's degree; 55. 9% have the bachelor's degree only. (See Table C-1.)

Current Study and Research

Although none of the respondents now holds a doctorate, a small percentage (2. 9%) is currently engaged in graduate work for the doctorate. Of these 77. 3% live in Detroit, its suburbs or Wayne County. The Central Michigan District, the Flint-Saginaw area, and the Kalamazoo area supply the remainder while in five districts no one responding is currently studying for the doctorate. In addition, 28.9% of the total are presently taking graduate studies for a master's degree and 7.2% are working for other degrees. In both cases Wayne County and the Detroit area supply the largest numbers, but together are less than half, and some are studying for these degrees in all geographical areas. More than half the total of teachers (57.8%), however, indicate they are not presently engaged in graduate work for a degree. (See Tables C-2 and C-3.)

The teachers working for a degree were asked at what institution they are studying. Seventeen colleges and universities, all in Michigan, are named by those replying. (See Table C-4.) Those listed by the largest numbers in order are Michigan State University, Wayne State University, the University of Michigan, Eastern and Western Michigan Universities (the same number), Central Michigan University and Northern Michigan University. The remaining ten schools are listed by less than ten respondents each.

Research needs are not limited to those doing research for an advanced degree. The teachers were asked if they are engaged in any research other than that required for an academic degree. To this question, again a small percentage (11.0%) drawn from all but one district (Southeast Michigan area) say they are so engaged. A very large number (87.7%) reply that they are not. (See Table C-5.)

Use of Library Materials

The teachers were provided a list of subject areas and were asked to check those in which they periodically use library materials. The subject areas were divided into two sections, "Curriculum Areas" and "Professional Education Areas." Table 2 lists the responses by subject areas in descending order. Because a respondent could check as many as he wished the total is substantially more than 100%.

Libraries Used

As noted above, elementary and secondary teachers have research and reference library needs to meet requirements for degrees they are seeking, to supply information for other research projects on which they are working, and to meet professional needs for information in a wide range of curriculum and professional education areas. To meet these professional reference and research needs,

Table 2

SUBJECT AREAS IN WHICH LIBRARY MATERIALS ARE PERIODICALLY USED

Area	Percent of Total Respondents
Curriculum Areas	
Social studies	41.4%
Science	32.0
English	25.2
History	22.7
Geography	18.3
Art	16.8
Physical education and recreation	10.0
Mathematics	8.5
Music	8.5
Speech	5.1
Foreign languages	4.2
Business	3.8
Home economics	1.6
Other	8.6
Professional Education Areas	
Teaching methods	34.7
Curriculum planning	27.7
Guidance	16.6
Counseling	14.9
Special education	10.4
Educational administration	10.0
Foundations of education	9.6
Student personnel administration	3.4
Other	3.5

the teachers were asked what libraries, if any, they use periodically. A total of 1,444 responses were received to this question and they cover libraries of all kinds in all parts of the state. Table 3 shows the distribution of responses by major library categories.

Table 3

TYPES OF LIBRARIES USED PERIODICALLY

Library	Percent of Total Responses
All public libraries	47.7%
School libraries	29.5
Michigan colleges and universities	18.3
Michigan State Library	3.0
Michigan community colleges	0.8
Out-of-state libraries	0.4
Personal	0.3
Total	100.0%

The individual libraries listed most often by the teachers are the Detroit Public Library (10.9% of total respondents), the Wayne State University Library (9.4%), and the Michigan State Library (5.3%). Table 4 shows the frequency with which these three libraries are used by the respondents who list them. (See Tables C-7 and C-10.)

Table 4

FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY USE

Library	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	No Answer	Total
Detroit Public	3.3%	7.8%	37.8%	50.0%	1.1%	100.0%
Wayne State University	15.4	11.5	21.8	47.4	3.9	
Michigan State Library	2.3	2.3	18.2	63.6	13.6	

In the sample group 44 respondents thus indicate that they use the Detroit Public Library once a month or more. If they are representative of the total population of school teachers from which the sample was drawn it appears that as many as four thousand teachers may use this library at least monthly; the numbers drawn by the Wayne State library are apparently only slightly smaller.

In addition to being asked which libraries they use, the teachers were also asked to evaluate the libraries (see Tables C-8 and C-9) and list which one is the most important for their professional needs. Again the libraries listed are large in number and wide in range. The list of libraries listed as most important, however, is similar to the list of those most frequently used. In order, the libraries listed most often as most important are the Detroit Public Library, Wayne State University Library, Michigan State University Library, and the Michigan State Library. It should be recalled that Michigan State University and Wayne State University are listed above as the two schools with the largest number of teacher respondents enrolled for graduate degree study; this may account, at least in part, for their importance to the professional needs of these respondents. The Detroit Public Library and Wayne State University draw mainly from the Detroit and suburban areas while the Michigan State Library and the Michigan State University draw from almost all regions of the state. (See Tables C-11 and C-12.)

Besides listing the library most important for their professional needs, the teachers were asked to evaluate its adequacy for their professional needs. Of the total replies, 23.8% said the library selected is very good; 32.1% good; 20.0% fair; 5.0% poor; and 19.1% give no reply. More than half the teachers consider the library selected to be good or very good. Table 5 shows the evaluation for the four libraries selected most often. These libraries are all more highly regarded than the average.

Table 5

ADEQUACY OF SELECTED LIBRARIES FOR PROFESSIONAL NEEDS

Library	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Detroit Public Library	61.4%	31.8%	4.5%	0	2.3%	100.0%
Wayne State University	65.0	32.5	2.5	0	0	
Michigan State University	76.2	14.3	4.8	4.7%	0	
Michigan State Library	56.3	43.7	0.0	0	0	

Finally, the teachers were asked if the library they had selected as most important is also the most conveniently located for them. Of the total respondents, 56.8% indicate that it is and 24.8% say that it is not (18.4% did not reply). Those who indicated that the designated library is not the most convenient — almost one-fourth of the total — were asked to select from a list the reason or reasons why the designated library is most important. Table 6 lists the reasons given in order of importance.

Table 6

REASONS (OTHER THAN CONVENIENCE OF LOCATION)
FOR SELECTING A LIBRARY AS MOST IMPORTANT

Reason	Percent of Respondents
General breadth of collection	67.3%
Depth of the specialized collection	60.0
Convenient hours	52.7
Quality of reference service	40.8
Broader selection of periodicals	40.0
Comfortable facilities	32.7
Liberal loan policies	28.3
Stack privileges	25.4
Availability of government documents	12.7
All others	7.3

Like the responses to the faculty questionnaire discussed in Chapter I, the most frequently listed reasons for using libraries other than the one ordinarily used are concerned with the quality of the collections themselves. In this case, these reasons are the general breadth of the collection and the depth of the specialized collection for which the teacher has a particular need. It is interesting to note, however, that the quality of reference service available appears as a much more significant consideration in the minds of school teachers than it does in the case of college and university faculty members. (Compare Table 8, Chapter I.)

MAJOR FINDINGS

In the paragraphs below are given the major findings with respect to the patterns of library use and reference and research needs of school teachers in Michigan.

1. Elementary and secondary school teachers have reference and research needs of at least three kinds:

   a. To undergird professional activities concerned with instructional programs both in the curriculum content areas and in the professional education fields;

   b. To support graduate studies for an advanced degree (on which almost two out of five are working, mainly at the master's level, but to a lesser extent also for the doctorate and other degrees); and

   c. For a smaller number, approximately one in nine, to assist research other than that undertaken for a degree.

2. Those teachers responding to the questionnaire who are presently engaged in graduate work are predominantly enrolled in the Michigan public universities including the three large state universities and the regional state universities.

3. While the heaviest concentration of respondents indicating research needs is in Wayne County including Detroit and the suburban counties immediately to the north, some teachers having the same reference and research needs are located in every geographical region of the state.

4. To meet their reference and research needs, teachers rely first of all on the public libraries led by the Detroit Public Library, secondly on their own school or school system libraries, thirdly on Michigan universities and colleges led by Wayne State University and Michigan State University. These are followed by the Michigan State Library. The Detroit Public and Wayne State University Libraries draw teachers heavily from the Detroit and suburban areas while the State Library and Michigan State University Library draw teacher users from almost every part of the state.

5. Well over half (and in the case of the four libraries mentioned in number 4, over 90%) of the respondents judge the library they name as most important to be good or very good in meeting their professional needs.

6. For over half the respondents the most important library is also the most conveniently located. For those who say it is not the most conveniently located, the major reasons for its selection as the most important are the breadth and depth of the collections and the convenient hours the library is open. Quality of reference service ranks much higher as a reason for a library's importance to school teachers than to college faculty members.

Chapter IV

MANUFACTURING EXECUTIVES AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

In addition to college and university faculty members, graduate and undergraduate students both on and off campus, and teachers, all of whom regularly use reference and research library resources, important segments of the general public have similar needs for information in their work. Doctors, lawyers, architects, and other professional groups, businessmen in all areas of manufacturing and commerce, labor leaders, government officials, and many others face problems and decisions requiring information from many sources.

As part of this study, it was decided to inquire into the needs of such groups for reference and research library resources. Since it was not feasible to make inquiries in all segments of the population, two groups were selected for further investigation. With the advice of the study Advisory Committee, the groups chosen were manufacturing executives and government officials.

Manufacturing Executives

A total of 1,851 names of manufacturing executives in Michigan were selected by random sampling from a published list. To this group a questionnaire was sent soliciting replies about sources of information, including libraries they use to meet their professional business needs. Of the total sent, usable replies were received from 476 or 25.7%. (For additional information see Appendix D.) The greater number of those replying are executives of small companies. Table 1 shows the distribution of responses by number of employees.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN COMPANY

Number of Employees	Percent of Total Responses
Less than 25	42.9%
25-99	28.6
100-249	11.8
250-999	9.0
Over 1,000	6.3
No answer	1.4
Total	100.0%

Each of the respondents was asked in what county he works. For the purposes of this study the counties are arrayed in the same district groupings as are used in the analysis of elementary and secondary school teachers (see Chapter III). The distribution of responses geographically by district is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT

	District	Percent of Total Responses
I.	Upper Peninsula	2.7%
II.	Northern Michigan	2.9
III.	Central Michigan	4.4
IV.	Grand Rapids - Muskegon area	14.7
V.	Flint-Saginaw area	5.7
VI.	Lansing area	6.5
VII.	Suburban Detroit area (counties other than Wayne)	12.8
VIII.	Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	11.6
IX.	Southeast Michigan (Jackson - Ann Arbor)	8.6
X.	Wayne County	18.1
	No answer	12.0
	Total	100.0%

Each executive was asked to select from a list the area of business activity in which his primary executive responsibility lies. More than three out of five select the category of general management as their area of primary responsibility. Table 3 shows this distribution of responses. This concentration occurs in spite of the fact that questionnaires were addressed in equal proportions to presidents, vice-presidents - manufacturing, sales managers, treasurers, directors of research, chief accountants, chief engineers, and personnel directors.

It seems probable that the replies reflect the wide ranging responsibilities of the executive in a small company rather than a substantial skewing of the results by function.

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY AREA OF PRIMARY EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

Area of Primary Executive Responsibility	Percent of Total Responses
Accounting	5.7%
Engineering	4.4
Finance	2.9
General management	60.7
Marketing	4.0
Personnel/industrial relations	4.2
Production	6.0
Research	1.3
Others	6.9
No answer	3.9
Total	100.0%

The small percentage of respondents who place themselves in the category of research suggests that the responses to the questionnaire should be viewed as reflecting the ordinary needs for information of a wide cross section of business executives mostly in small companies rather than the needs of those, typically found in the larger companies, who are engaged full-time in seeking knowledge and information and who thus make heavy use of available reference and research resources.

In the questionnaire a list of sources of information was included and each respondent was asked to select those four which are the most important for keeping him abreast of developments in his area of executive responsibility. He was asked to assign the numbers from 1 to 4 to his selections in order of importance. In the subsequent analysis these choices were weighted, giving 5 points for a first choice, 4 for a second choice, 3 for a third, 2 for a fourth, and 1 if the item was checked, but no number rank of importance given by the respondent. Table 4 shows the weighted rank order of importance in which the sources of information were selected by the business executive. For comparison, the rank order of first choices is also shown. (See also Table D-1.)

Table 4

SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR BUSINESS EXECUTIVES IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

Information Source	Weighted Order of Rank	First Choice Order of Rank
Business magazines (Business Week, Nation's Business, etc.)	1	2
Newspapers	2	1
Informal conversations with associates	3	3
Professional journals (Harvard Business Review, The Journal of Accountancy, etc.)	4	4
Subscription services (Kiplinger Letter, NICB reports, etc.)	5	6
Technical reports	6	5
Seminars, conferences	7	8
Company memoranda	8	7
Conventions	9	10
Books	10	11
Other	11	9

Several of the sources of information in this list are not related in any way to libraries and some, such as the business magazines and professional journals, may be either subscribed to personally or obtained through libraries. The order of importance emphasizes the priority of current information in the mind of the business executive while the low rank of books implies little reliance upon general texts or older or historical information.

On the specific subject of the use of library materials, respondents were asked two questions. First, they were asked in which of a given list of subject matter areas they recurrently use library materials, and second, in which of these areas would they use such library materials if they were readily available. The replies to these questions are shown in Table 5. In only three of the subject matter areas (engineering, production, and management theory) are as many as 10% of the respondents recurrently using library materials, and in all subject areas less than 10% say they would use them if readily available in the future. It should also be noted that in only two subject matter areas (data processing and statistics) do a higher percentage state they would use library materials, if readily available, than are recurrently using them now. These figures indicate a relatively low level of use of library materials by manufacturing executives; at the same time they show a wide range of subject matter areas in which information is sought.

Table 5

USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS IN SELECTED SUBJECT MATTER AREAS

Subject Matter Area	Percent of Respondents Who Recurrently Use	Percent of Respondents Who Would Use
Accounting	8.2%	4.6%
Finance	8.0	4.2
Engineering	12.6	6.7
Science	7.4	2.7
Production	10.3	5.5
Industrial relations	8.2	6.3
Personnel administration	7.6	5.9
Management theory	10.7	6.9
Marketing	8.2	4.2
International business	2.1	1.5
Data processing	3.4	3.8
Operations research	4.2	2.7
Statistics	2.7	3.6
Government regulations	7.4	5.3
Reference material (atlases, dictionaries, directories, etc.)	6.9	3.2
Others	1.5	0.6
None	0.2	0.2

Libraries Used

Of the total number of business respondents, 23. 1% report that their company has a library and 74. 6% indicate that it does not (2. 3% did not reply). Those who do have company libraries were asked how often they use them. The replies are: several times a week, 40. 2%; once a week, 21. 4%; monthly, 12. 5%; infrequently, 21. 4%; never, 1. 8%; and no answer, 2. 7%. (See Table D-5.) It appears that in those companies that do have libraries they are heavily used.

These same respondents were asked to evaluate the adequacy of their company libraries for meeting their own professional needs.

Of those who have company libraries, their adequacy is judged: 17.9% very good, 31.3% good, 37.5% fair, 7.1% poor. (See Table D-7.)

With less than one-quarter of the respondents reporting company libraries, the questionnaire asked what libraries, other than the company library, are used for professional business needs and how frequently they are used. The three libraries most often named are the Detroit Public Library (44 times), the Grand Rapids Public Library (14 times), and the University of Michigan Library (12 times). The Michigan State Library and five public libraries (Dearborn, Hackley, Herrick, Kalamazoo, and Lansing) are each named 5 to 9 times, and all other libraries are named by less than 5 respondents each. These libraries, however, are not frequently used for meeting professional needs of businessmen. The overall frequency of use of libraries, other than the company library, is reported as: 2.1% several times a week, 8.1% once a week, 17.0% monthly, and 69.0% infrequently. (See Table D-6.)

The executives were then asked to specify which of the libraries they use is the most important for their professional needs. Of those who replied (215) more than half (52.1%) choose a public library, 38.2% choose a business library (including their own), and 9.7% choose other libraries. (See Table D-4.) Of the total replies, 32.1% indicate that their company library is the most important one, and 14% select the Detroit Public Library. All other respondents to this question, more than half of the total, select a large number of libraries with no one library receiving as much as 5% of the total. Slightly more than 90% of those who select the Detroit Public Library are located in Wayne County or adjacent counties of the suburban Detroit area. Proximity characterizes other selections as well.

The respondents were asked to indicate, from a list included in the questionnaire, the main reasons for using libraries other than the company library. The reasons in the order in which they were most frequently given are: (1) no company library, (2) depth of the specialized collection, (3) general breadth of the collection, (4) quality of reference service, (5) convenient location, (6) broader selection of periodicals, (7) convenient hours and the availability of government documents (each was selected the same number of times), (8) comfortable facilities, (9) liberal loan policies, and (10) stack privileges.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1. The business executive, especially in comparatively small manufacturing companies, relies for information he needs in his profession largely on current materials, such as magazines and newspapers, and to a considerable extent on non-library sources, including conversations with associates and attendance at conferences.

2. Slightly less than one-fourth of the respondents indicate that their company has a library, but where a library exists it is frequently used; 61.6% indicate use of the company library once a week or more. Judgment of the adequacy of the company library is almost equally divided between those who consider it very good or good and those who think it is only fair or poor.

3. When choosing a library outside the company, the library most frequently used is a public library with significant but lesser use of university libraries. The public library selected is usually the local one. There is a relatively heavy business use of selected libraries through interlibrary loan. (See Table 13, Chapter I.)

4. More than half of the respondents select a public library as the most important for their own use, with the total business libraries, including their company library, being selected by more than one-third.

5. Aside from the reason that a company has no library of its own, the most important reasons for using other libraries relate to the quality of the collections and convenience of location.

Government Officials

Large numbers of civil servants — whether employed by federal, state or local agencies — clearly have no continuing need for reference and research materials to carry out their routine functions. On the other hand for a smaller number of government employees, typically in middle and senior positions, access to a wide range of information sources is essential to the successful conduct of their jobs. Accordingly it was decided that rather than make a broad and random canvass of government personnel via questionnaire, the inquiry would be limited to selected interviews with a small number of officials known to rely upon reference and research materials in their jobs. The object of the inquiry thus was not to attempt to quantify the extent of reliance on such materials among government agency personnel, but rather to discover, from a small number of persons known to require access to information, the nature of their needs and the extent to which these needs are satisfied under present conditions.

Accordingly interviews were held with 18 government officials in Lansing, Detroit and Escanaba. Those interviewed included eight state officials in Lansing, two state officials and five local government officials in Detroit, and one state, one local, and one federal government official in Escanaba. Those interviewed were employed by nine different state agencies, six local agencies, and one federal agency.

The state agencies were the Department of Agriculture, Economic Opportunity Office, Michigan Tax Commission, Social Services Department, Civil Service Commission, Attorney General's Department, Public Service Commission, Legislative Service Bureau, and the Office of the Secretary of State. Five local agencies were departments of the city of Detroit; they were Welfare, Building and Safety Engineering, Public Works, the Comptroller's Office, and the Office of Industrial and Commercial Development. One local agency (Public Health) was in Escanaba. The federal government agency was the Forestry Service.

Generally those interviewed have great need for large amounts of information, usually specific and current, in their daily work. Often the information needed is so current that it may not have been published and can only be found in their own or colleagues' files.

In addition to their own office files and reports and those of their colleagues, those interviewed indicate that a major source of information is counterpart officials in other states and cities. Information of this kind may be exchanged by telephone or letter, occasionally by personal visits, and through the meetings and journals of their professional associations. One source of a large number of reports in almost all fields is the United States government publications and, in those state agencies which work closely with federal agencies, a call to Washington is often the quickest way to get information.

In almost all government agencies the time factor is an important one. Information is frequently needed the same day it is requested and slow replies are often of little or no use. This urgency gives unusual importance to information sources, including libraries, which are situated on the premises of the government agency or at least in the city where it is located. The need for immediate answers also tends to discourage the use of interlibrary loans.

Several of the officials interviewed report that their agencies have small reference collections of materials for their specific needs immediately at hand in their offices. These collections, however, tend to be very limited in materials, although they are occasionally supplemented by agency subscriptions to major journals in the professional field concerned.

In Lansing and in Detroit, special library branches have been established to serve government agencies. The Michigan State Library has a law branch in the Capitol Building and a general branch to serve state agencies in the Cass Building. In Detroit, the Public Library has a Municipal Reference Library located in the City-County Building downtown. In both Lansing and Detroit, these special branches are widely used by personnel of government agencies. The officials interviewed, with few exceptions, find them of great assistance in meeting the need for current newspapers, journals, and other periodicals as well as for general background and reference information.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1. The need for current information is the dominant reference requirement of the government officials interviewed.

2. Several sources are relied on for such information including office files and reports, counterpart officials, United States government publications, and local libraries.

3. Speed of access is usually important; answers to questions are frequently needed immediately. This limits use of libraries to those on-site or nearby.

4. The special branches established to serve government officials in Lansing by the Michigan State Library and in Detroit by the Detroit Public Library are well used and generally considered by those interviewed to be of great value in meeting current government needs. Officials in other areas often rely on telephone calls to their headquarters to get necessary information.

PART TWO

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the end of each chapter in Part One the most important findings are summarized. However, a further summary is provided here to bring together the major findings of the inquiry and to relate the findings to one another where appropriate. Thereafter conclusions are drawn and a set of recommendations is presented.

FINDINGS

In reviewing the data obtained in the course of the survey it is apparent that some findings point up the special needs or patterns of use of particular user groups while others emphasize the commonality of the responses. These differences are reflected in the summary statements below.

F1. The campus library is judged by faculty members to be the most frequently used library and the most important library for both themselves and their students regardless of the type of institution, the adequacy of its library or its proximity to other libraries. (Chapter I and Tables A-2, 3, 4.)

F2. In the eight state colleges and universities other than the University of Michigan, Wayne State University and Michigan State University, 50% or more of the faculty members responding from each institution consider their campus libraries only fair or poor with respect to adequacy in their fields of specialization. (Chapter I and Table A-5.)

F3. With respect to undergraduate needs at these same eight institutions, 28% to 70.7% (overall institutional average 50.6%) consider the general breadth of the collection only fair or poor, and 25% to 65.9% (overall institutional average 48.6%) consider the depth of the collection only fair or poor in the fields they teach. (Chapter I and Tables A-24, 25.)

F4. With respect to graduate needs the University of Michigan and Wayne State University receive high ratings from the faculty respondents with respect to both breadth and depth of collection. At Michigan State University 51.6% consider the collection only fair or poor with respect to depth of collection and 48.1% so rate it with respect to breadth of collection. At the remaining six public institutions offering graduate work the fair and poor ratings together range from 63.8% to 85.8% with respect to depth of collection and from 56.9% to 78.6% with respect to general breadth of the collection. (Chapter I and Tables A-35, 36.)

F5. The most persistently reported single shortcoming of the campus library, in the view of faculty respondents, is the insufficient numbers of multiple copies. (Chapter I, Table 17 and Tables A-26, 28, 37, 38.)

F6. At the colleges and universities satisfaction with library collections increases with length of service and academic rank. (Chapter I, Tables A-6, 7.)

F7. The demand for periodicals, journals and other sources of current information is dominant in all fields explored — among business executives, government officials and in all major academic areas at the colleges and universities. (Chapters I and IV, and Tables A-23 and D-1.)

F8. More than three-fifths of faculty members responding to the questionnaire who teach the same courses off-campus as on-campus for the same institution make different assignments to the two groups of students; more than four out of five who make different assignments attribute this difference entirely or in part to differences in library resources; and more than 71% of those giving different assignments are of the opinion that library limitations off-campus affect the achievement of their off-campus students adversely. (Chapter II and Table B-2.)

F9. Despite limited library resources more than half the off-campus faculty responding tailor their course work reading assignments to library materials available locally, and of those who do, over 86% say that this restricts them to some extent in compiling reading lists. In addition, between 80% and 90% of the faculty who give different assignments report that general reference and background materials and multiple copies of important titles are less available off-campus than on-campus, and more than 90% indicate that the subject matter collections in the fields they teach are less complete off-campus. (Chapter II and Tables B-3, 4.)

F10. More than 90% of the responding faculty of off-campus centers report that their teaching plans call for the same or greater reliance on library resources in the future. (Chapter II and Table B-7.)

F11. At the time of the survey the nine institutions offering off-campus programs reported course offerings in 166 communities. In 33 of these communities two universities are involved; in 11 communities three universities and in three communities four universities. (Chapter II and Table B-8.)

F12. Elementary and secondary school teachers use libraries in pursuit of their own professional goals for three primary reasons: (a) to undergird professional activities concerned with instructional programs both in the curriculum content areas and in the professional education field; (b) to support graduate studies for an advanced degree; and (c) to assist research other than that undertaken for a degree. (Chapter III and Tables C-2, 3, 5.)

F13. Teachers rely first on the public libraries to meet their own professional library needs, beginning with the Detroit Public Library. (Chapter III and Table C-7.)

F14. Quality of reference service available is considered by school teachers to be of much greater importance in selecting a library than is the case with college and university faculty. (Chapter III, Table 6 and Chapter I, Table 8.)

F15. Among the sampling of manufacturing executives queried (in predominantly small companies) the company library is heavily used where it exists; libraries outside the company are used, on the whole, infrequently. When recourse is had to outside libraries, the most frequent calls are made on the Detroit Public Library, the Grand Rapids Public Library and the University of Michigan. Next most frequently used are other public libraries and the state library. (Chapter IV and Tables D-5, 6.)

F16. Among government officials interviewed special emphasis is given to speed of access to current materials and to the value of the special branches established for their use by the Michigan State Library and the Detroit Public Library. (Chapter IV.)

F17. Five libraries emerge repeatedly as heavily used statewide resources meeting the reference and research needs of major groups of users, including faculty and students of the colleges and universities, elementary and secondary school teachers and to a lesser extent manufacturing executives and government officials. These five libraries are the Detroit Public Library, the Michigan State Library and the libraries of the University of Michigan, Wayne State University and Michigan State University. (Chapters I, III, IV and Tables A-2, 3, 4, 12, 29, 45; C-7, 10, 11, 12; and D-6.)

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions offered below are separated into two categories in order to distinguish clearly those which are derived from the survey data and those which are derived from a variety of other circumstances.

Conclusions from the Survey Data

While a large number of conclusions might be drawn from the survey data those given below are limited to a few major deductions which appear to warrant particular concern. Attention is limited here to general aspects calling for corrective action as distinct from those largely favorable or largely unfavorable aspects that might be pointed up if one were concerned primarily with conditions at particular institutions. Each major institution is in a position to assess for itself the implications of the data contained in the report.

C1. The greatest library needs identified by college and university faculty members can only be met by substantially strengthening the individual campus libraries. The urgent need for strengthening of campus libraries is evident at all of the public regional colleges and universities. Inter-institutional cooperation cannot contribute significantly to the relief of shortcomings caused by inadequate breadth or depth of collections for normal undergraduate use or by shortages of available seats or of multiple copies of frequently used materials. (See F1, 2, 3, 4, 5 above.)

C2. Weaknesses in library services to off-campus students, having an adverse effect upon their performance as compared to campus students, call for urgent corrective attention. The judgment of faculty members teaching the same courses off-campus and on-campus for the same institution points to a general condition which none of the institutions affected can afford to ignore. (See F8, 9, 10 above.)

C3. Unlike campus library conditions, improvements in off-campus library service can at least in part be achieved through interinstitutional cooperation. Among the 47 communities in which two or more universities currently offer off-campus courses are many in which no adequate library service or facility exists and in which cooperative efforts may offer the only realistic hope of providing adequate service in the near future. (See F11 above.)

C4. The large number of elementary and secondary school teachers throughout the state (over 80,000), their heavy dependence on nearby public libraries, and the importance they attach to the quality of reference service in the libraries they use, emphasizes the necessity for a high quality of public library service at the reference level and even at the intermediate research level in all parts of the state. (See F12, 13, 14 above.)

C5. Only one of the five libraries shown to be serving as a major statewide reference and research resource — the State Library — is explicitly created and designed to serve in such a statewide capacity. Three others — the libraries of the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Michigan State University — have primary obligations to their own faculty and student constituencies. The fifth — the Detroit Public Library — is at present supported almost solely by the city of Detroit. Explicit recognition of the statewide role of all five libraries, together with appropriate provisions for the support of that role, is ultimately necessary. (See F17 above.)

Conclusions from the Circumstances

In the course of a survey of the present kind, many impressions, facts, expectations, and opinions converge in the course of interviews, observations, and analysis. They do not derive from the questionnaire data reported in Part One; however, their importance in shaping the total picture cannot be denied. They also lead to conclusions; these conclusions must be presented as explicitly as those already given above if the recommendations which follow in the next section are to be fully understood.

C6. Internal institutional pressures on the three large university libraries will probably serve to limit their ability to meet external demands. On each campus it can be expected that faculty and student requirements for materials, services and space will exceed the ability of the library to comfortably provide. These pressures are already great; it seems more likely that they will increase than that they will subside in the years immediately ahead.

C7. Therefore, any plans for rationalizing the provision of reference and research resources in the state should limit dependence on these three libraries, so far as possible, to materials and services they alone are uniquely able to provide — that are not available elsewhere in the state.

C8. The above conclusion suggests, inturn, that a hierarchical pattern of access to resources may be required, each level screening demands, servicing those it can, and passing on to the next level only those it cannot satisfy.

C9. Important elements of library planning in major universities in Michigan will inevitably follow upon, rather than determine, policy decisions affecting the basic missions of these institutions. For example it does not appear to be realistic to propose the development of a coordinated acquisitions policy agreement among the major university libraries at this time. Such an agreement, aimed at reducing competition for the purchase of little used and expensive material, is feasible if there exists an overarching agreement on the graduate and post-doctoral research activities appropriate to each institution. In the absence of such an understanding the growth of special collections is an indispensable part of the institution's arsenal of weapons in the battle for new doctoral programs.

C10. The development of information-sharing networks at the highest research level is not likely to follow state lines. National and regional planning should and will preempt the field; that is the only efficient and economical approach. Michigan will have its share in such plans, as is evident from the designation of the University of Michigan as a regional center for the MEDLARS computer tape program of the National Library of Medicine. At Wayne State there has been established the Center for the Application of Science and Technology (CAST) which has on computer tapes information on publications of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the aerospace publications of the Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; bibliographic and abstract searches are supplied by CAST to customers for a fee and in some cases copies of the original articles and reports can also be supplied in microform. These computer programs play significant parts as research resources within their limited areas of concern and undoubtedly more such programs will be developed. It is better for Michigan to plan to continue to participate in the development of similar regional and national programs in other fields than to attempt to establish such networks on a statewide basis.

C11. Any plans for cooperative library resources development must take into account the chief concerns of those institutions whose library resources must be available if such plans are to succeed. In the preliminary reconnaissance study preceding the present survey[1] four major concerns were identified: (a) a concern that service to the institution's primary constituency might deteriorate; (b) a concern that cooperation in sharing of resources would serve as a substitute for building adequate basic collections at each institution; (c) a concern that compensation for services would be inadequate; and (d) a concern that cooperation might lead to centralized control. The preceding conclusions and the recommendations which follow have been prepared with these concerns in mind.

---

[1] Suggested Guidelines for a Comprehensive Survey of Reference and Research Library Cooperation in Michigan, Nelson Associates, 1965.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered to meet the needs revealed by the above findings and conclusions.

Recommendation 1. Intermediate reference centers should be established in Michigan providing reference and intermediate research services to all segments of the state community. These reference centers should be established in those areas where the demand seems greatest with the understanding that additional centers may be established from time to time. We suggest that the first centers be established in Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Kalamazoo and Houghton. (Detroit presents a special case, discussed below.) They would not be designated "regional" centers; the concentrations of population and the locations of the appropriate libraries do not lend themselves to the drawing of regional boundaries.

Keeping in mind the need for access to libraries to be hierarchical, the intermediate reference centers would provide a second-level function. They would serve both the individual library patron on the premises and other libraries through interlibrary loan. The libraries served would include private and public colleges and universities wishing to supplement their own collections, school libraries, public libraries, and special libraries for business and other organizations.

These intermediate reference centers would possess materials and personnel enabling them (1) to satisfy intermediate reference needs which the local or institutional library cannot meet, (2) to identify with precision those needs of the patron which go beyond the capacity of the reference center to meet and which would have to be met by the major statewide resource libraries or possibly by out-of-state sources, (3) to specify accurately by author and title those reference requests to be forwarded, and (4) to transmit these requests to the proper library to satisfy the patron's needs.

To provide these services the intermediate reference centers would include in their collections a wide range of basic reference works and strong periodical collections probably in the range of 1,500 to 2,000 titles. The centers would have extensive collections of indexes, catalogues, subject-finding lists, and other bibliographical tools to aid the patron to identify and specify the particular materials he is seeking. The center would be equipped for rapid reproduction of materials by means of xerography or photocopy.

The center would require high-quality reference library personnel.

The intermediate reference center should be established by strengthening the reference division of an already strong library in the community rather than by the establishment of a totally new facility. In Flint and Grand Rapids, both of which have several colleges and off-campus teaching centers in or near the city, the public library would seem to be the appropriate institution to develop as an intermediate center. Already these libraries are being used by students, faculty, teachers, business and other groups to meet intermediate reference demands.

In Kalamazoo the library of Western Michigan University is already an important reference resource and could be designated an intermediate reference center, and in Houghton the library of Michigan Technological University could be so developed to serve the entire Upper Peninsula. Western Michigan University, growing rapidly, may be caught up in the same inexorable internal pressures as exist at the three largest state institutions, in which case it would be better in the long run to designate the public library in Kalamazoo.

In Lansing there are already two major reference libraries — the State Library and the Michigan State University Library. Arguments for and against designating either one as an intermediate reference center can be readily made. The arguments against designating MSU have already been discussed. (See conclusions C6, C7, and C8 above.) On the other hand, it can be argued that the Michigan State Library has the responsibility of serving other libraries on a statewide basis and should not give extensively of its time, efforts and collection to the walk-in patrons of a particular area. The State Library could undoubtedly continue to serve the intermediate reference function for some time to come. Ultimately, however, it may be necessary and desirable to designate the public library to serve this function in the Lansing area.

In Detroit the pattern of use of the library at all levels by a constituency reaching well beyond the city limits has led to the demonstration program now in process of development. This could lead to a fundamental expansion of its legal constituency and base of support. The concept, keyed to the large metropolitan complex, goes well beyond that envisaged in the proposed intermediate reference centers. There is no question that in any rational plan of library development the Detroit Public Library would continue to meet intermediate reference needs in the metropolitan area.

It is suggested that the initiative in establishing the intermediate reference centers be exercised by the State Library.

Recommendation 2. The Detroit Public Library, the Michigan State Library and the libraries of Michigan State University, Wayne State University and the University of Michigan should all be designated statewide resource libraries. The budgets of these libraries should be augmented by state funds as needed to support their responsibilities as statewide resource libraries.

The proposed designation, coupled with the designation of intermediate reference centers, would serve to emphasize the special character of these five libraries. The aim would be to relieve them, and especially the three large university libraries, of requests more appropriately filled at the intermediate centers and, furthermore, to help insure that requests reaching these statewide resource libraries are received in a form enabling them to be processed quickly and with a minimum of unnecessary effort.

It is not feasible to assess the costs of the services to be provided until such time as the screening of patron requests is being accomplished through the intermediate reference centers. Only then will it be apparent how large the residual volume of work will be. The distribution of the workload among the five libraries will then also become apparent.

It is suggested that in the development of the plan of referral to the five major libraries, sufficient information on the nature of each of the collections be disseminated to the intermediate reference centers so that all requests that can be handled by the state library are sent there directly, and that the remainder of the requests be distributed as equitably as possible consistent with rapid response to patron needs. (Also see Recommendation 4 below.)

Since all five libraries serve as statewide resources, in fact, the formalization of the structure may initially reduce the demands on these libraries because of the added capacity of those libraries designated to carry on the intermediate function. But it can be anticipated that in the long run demand will increase, though at a more appropriate level, and funding will be required to support the function. The available data suggest that the Detroit Public Library in particular is supplying statewide services without supporting state funds.

Systematic data collection using uniform units of measurement, and including periodic sampling of patterns of referral by type of requesting library and by nature of request should be maintained by the five libraries to facilitate equitable funding and improvements in service.

Recommendation 3. Cooperatively planned and developed library collections and facilities for off-campus students should be provided in communities where off-campus centers are located and (1) there is no permanent off-campus center library, and (2) the local library is not designated as an intermediate reference center, and (3) more than one university offers courses locally. It is suggested that plans be developed for each community by means of a committee consisting of representatives of each of the universities' extension staffs offering courses in the community, each of the same universities' library staffs and in most cases the head of the local public library. Initiative in causing the formation of the committees should be taken by the chief of off-campus programs at the universities affected. They should also jointly establish a list of communities in order of priority for cooperative library planning, based upon needs as measured by the extent and level of course offerings and the weakness of the library resources in the community.

These committees would give primary attention to:

- the building of a basic reference collection useful for continuing off-campus programs covering the appropriate academic areas at the undergraduate (and graduate, if necessary) level
- the provision of supplementary collections of materials for one or more terms to be used in specific courses taught at the center and
- the provision of suitable space and hours of operation to meet the needs of off-campus students and faculty.

As shown in Chapter II (Table 4) the type of library currently most used by the off-campus student, in the judgment of his teachers, is the local public library. In many of the smaller communities the public library is conveniently located so that the student would not have far to go. Some of the off-campus programs are already housing their books in local public libraries. For these reasons it would seem wise for those universities which do not have permanent off-campus libraries at selected sites, due to limited space or other reasons, to join usually with the local public library to establish on the latter's site services for the off-campus program.

In communities, large or small, where there are several universities sponsoring off-campus programs and none is building a full-scale university library, one reference library at the local public library to serve the needs of off-campus students and faculty from all centers would appear to be more useful and less duplicating of effort and collections than would separate library collections for each university program.

The argument may be made that the objectives of a public library and a university library are quite distinct so that collections, services, and needed professional library skills are different. To some extent this is undoubtedly true. But the data gathered in Michigan show that, in fact, the services overlap to a considerable degree and that college and university faculty and students, both on and off campus, are already making extensive use of public library resources. A cooperative program between university and public libraries to provide better services and collections for off-campus programs would recognize this existing fact and build realistically upon it. The State Library should be called upon by off-campus directors to maintain and transport small special collections for specific courses which are organized at shifting sites around the state.

In those communities where an intermediate reference center is located, this center should serve typically as the central library for off-campus programs in the community, and the committee formed would have a representative of the reference center serving in place of the local library.

Use of a local public library to serve off-campus programs may often call for an extension of library hours and for building up the basic reference collection. These added services should be provided by the library under contract to the university off-campus program offices. If this proves in practice to be too cumbersome, direct funding by the state to the libraries for this purpose should be provided.

* * * * *

The establishment of intermediate reference centers, the planned improvement of off-campus library services, and the designation of five major libraries as statewide resource libraries provides a pyramid of reference and research library resources as illustrated in the diagram on the following page.

Recommendation 4. The Michigan State Library, with the advice and assistance of an appropriate consultation committee, should prepare and distribute a union list of serials. In the beginning it should include the serials held by the intermediate reference centers and the statewide resource libraries. In time it should be expanded to include the holdings of other public and private universities and selected special libraries in the state.

The survey data amply document the dominant place of periodical literature in the current patterns of library use among the major groups queried. The need for stronger periodical collections would be met in part by the special emphasis given to such materials in the proposed intermediate reference centers. Beyond this, however, is the need for a key to unlock the doors to these materials, a comprehensive and current finding tool. Copies of such a union list, including the necessary periodic updatings, should be on virtually every library shelf in the state. Patrons would thereby discover the availability of many items not only at the University of Michigan, for example, but also at a nearby intermediate reference center. Librarians in all types of libraries would be appreciably aided in meeting requests and in sending referrals to the proper agencies.

Because of the immense periodical holdings of the University of Michigan in particular, the cost of developing and maintaining such a union list would be substantial. If necessary as an economy measure certain esoteric subject fields, and perhaps certain foreign languages, might be excluded in the beginning.

It is anticipated that the union list will have to be computer produced and maintained. In that case later interfiling of additional titles will present no insuperable difficulty.

SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM
OF
SUGGESTED PATTERN OF REFERENCE AND RESEARCH LIBRARY SERVICES IN MICHIGAN

STATEWIDE RESOURCE LIBRARIES				
Detroit Public Library	Wayne State University	Michigan State Library	Michigan State University	University of Michigan

INTERMEDIATE REFERENCE CENTERS					
Flint	Kalamazoo	Grand Rapids	Lansing	Houghton	Others

LIBRARIES					
Public Libraries	Special Libraries	College Libraries	Community College Libraries	Public School Libraries	Off-Campus Library Services

INDIVIDUAL PATRONS
Users of Reference and Research Library Resources

Recommendation 5. A Coordinating Council on Reference and Research Library Resources should be established; the Council should be instructed to report to the Governor annually for ten years.

A strong body of workable size is needed to assure that urgently required programs are begun; that momentum is sustained; that problems and opportunities are identified and appropriate plans developed to meet them.

It is suggested that the proposed coordinating council be established by the Governor and that it be composed of 11 members as follows:

5 - representatives of statewide resource libraries, namely the chief librarians of the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Wayne State University, the Detroit Public Library, and the Michigan State Library

1 - representative of the State Board for Libraries, in its capacity as an advisory body to the State Department of Education

1 - representative of the intermediate reference centers, chosen by vote of the chief librarians of these centers (ineligible to vote or serve would be any librarian whose library is also a statewide resource library)

1 - college librarian

1 - community college librarian

1 - special library representative

1 - off-campus program librarian

- these latter four to be chosen by the Board of the Michigan Library Association, in consultation with its appropriate sections.

The chairmanship, it is suggested, should rotate annually among the chief librarians of the five statewide resource libraries. The State Library should serve as the secretariat for the Council.

The Council would be charged in general with the responsibility for encouraging improvement in reference and research library service by coordination of planning on a statewide basis, and in particular:

- to coordinate the systematic and continuing collection of information on reference and research materials in the state and on patterns of library use
- to propose to the appropriate decision making bodies improvements in service or more economical operations through coordinated effort
- to review location of intermediate reference centers and to suggest additional sites if needed
- to assess progress in the improvement of library service to off-campus students, and to devise means for further improvement, for referral to the appropriate officials
- to suggest further refinements and specifications, on the basis of experience, with respect to standards and kinds of service at the statewide resource libraries, the intermediate reference centers and the off-campus library service outlets
- to assess the implications for statewide planning of the Detroit Public Library demonstration of service in the greater metropolitan area, and
- to suggest such additional surveys, research projects, and data gathering efforts as may contribute to further understanding of library needs and opportunities at the reference and research level.

In its annual report to the Governor, the Council would be asked to provide

- factual information on the use of statewide resource libraries, intermediate reference centers, and off-campus library services — by type of user and by county of origin of user — based on sampling and/or other reliable methods of data collection; and including annual comparative tables of such data
- a report on the progress during the biennium in improving coordination of reference resources in the state and in improving access to such resources by all Michigan citizens in need of them

- recommendations for legislation, if needed, to strengthen and improve the quality of reference and research library services statewide.

* * * * *

It is evident that the five recommendations offered above provide only the beginning steps in a program to strengthen and improve the coordination of library resources in Michigan. Further progress will depend essentially upon (a) the strengthening of nearly all campus libraries in the state, private and public, and particularly those of the six regional public colleges and universities (see Conclusion 1 earlier in this chapter), and (b) further delineation of the distinct roles and missions of each of the public institutions of higher education, which in turn would establish the foundation for fully articulated and cooperative programs of acquisitions and services by these libraries (see also Conclusion 9). One cannot predict how soon these important developments will take place, but it is hoped that the suggested Coordinating Council may be able to give impetus to these needed developments.

Many aspects of library service may be improved, however, by the attention of individual librarians. The data collected in this study provide commentary on many aspects of library service hitherto obscure or only suspected. The data contained in the first four chapters and in the appendixes provide starting points for rumination and further inquiry. Such reflection is not dependent for its value upon statewide planning in many cases; in some instances it may be that improvements in service in individual libraries can be developed after discovering the reasons that lie behind the responses received. For example, the study reports a deficiency of multiple copies of heavily used materials on virtually all campuses. Does this deficiency reflect a problem in the library or a problem in curriculum planning? Should more reliance be placed on inexpensive texts which students could purchase? What priorities are the librarian, the faculty, and the administration prepared to place upon supplying multiple copies as opposed to spending acquisitions funds on broadening and deepening the collection?

The survey data also reveal that the higher the rank of the faculty member and the longer the tenure of his service at the institution the more adequate he judges the libraries to be. What does this mean? Does it mean that the older faculty members are better acquainted with the library and as a result have a higher respect for its collections? Does it mean that the heaviest research requirements are falling upon the younger men and they are thus less satisfied?

The data also reveal perhaps rather surprisingly that elementary and secondary school teachers rely rather heavily upon their own school libraries not just for student requirements, but for their own professional needs. What implications does this finding have for the acquisitions policies of school libraries and local public libraries?

These examples illustrate that much improvement in reference and research library service can probably be achieved by the efforts of individual librarians working with their constituent groups as well as by participation in broader cooperative enterprises.

APPENDIX A

Most of the data gathered on the reference and research needs and patterns of library use of college and university faculty and students discussed in Chapter I of this report were taken from the replies to a questionnaire distributed to all faculty members of four-year institutions of higher learning, both public and private, in Michigan (see Appendix E for a copy of the questionnaire).

During March and early April 1966 the questionnaires were distributed to faculty members who mailed the completed questionnaires direct to the Michigan State Library. Of the total distributed of 14,969, usable returns were received from 4,877 or 32.6%. Table A-1 shows the number distributed, the number of completed questionnaires returned, and the percent of return for the 44 colleges and universities from which responses were received. The rate of return ranges from 2.3% to 73.8%.

A small number of the total returns could not be identified by school, but could be identified from the postmark for the area from which they were mailed, and a still smaller number could be identified neither by school nor area. These returned questionnaires are listed in Table A-1 as "Others" and are included in totals on the following tables.

The tables in Appendix A, drawn from the responses to this questionnaire, support and supplement in more detail the information in Chapter I. Tables A-2 through A-23, on the professional needs of the faculty, are based on responses to Part I of the questionnaire. Tables A-24 through A-34, on undergraduate library needs, are based on Part II; and Tables A-35 through A-45, on graduate students' library needs, are based on Part III.

The distribution of responses to this questionnaire by academic rank for the total group of respondents show full professor 22.6%, associate professor 18.5%, assistant professor 24.1%, instructor and lecturer 15.0%, and all others 19.8%. In the American Council on Education's publication, American Universities and Colleges, 9th Edition, 1964, 31 colleges and universities are listed for the State of Michigan and 30 of these sent responses to this questionnaire. The distribution of the faculty by academic rank for these institutions listed is full professor 21.9%, associate professor 19.6%, assistant professor 23.1%, instructor and lecturer 15.0%, and all others 20.4%. The survey response and the published distribution are within 1% of one another at all academic ranks except associate professor where the survey response was 1.1% less than the published distribution. This would indicate that the survey response corresponded closely to the total population surveyed on this factor of academic rank, assuming that the proportions did not change substantially from the time between 1962-63, the base year for the American Council on Education data, and 1965-66, the academic year of the present survey.

As will be noted on Table A-1, the number of responses from several schools is quite small, in some cases being only one. In order to make these responses statistically meaningful in distributions on the tables, the private colleges (with the exception of the University of Detroit which is listed separately) are combined into three geographical groupings. These combinations and the schools included in each area are as follows:

1. Detroit and Suburban Area—Cranbrook Academy, Detroit Bible College, Detroit College of Business, Detroit College of Law, Detroit Institute of Technology, General Motors Institute, Madonna College, Maryglade College, Marygrove College, Mercy College, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Sacred Heart Seminary, St. John's Provincial Seminary, and Other Detroit Area.

2. Southern Michigan Area—Adrian College, Albion College, Andrews University, Cleary College, Hillsdale College, Kalamazoo College, Nazareth College, Olivet College, Sacred Heart Novitiate, Siena Heights College, Spring Arbor College, and Other Kalamazoo Area.

3. Central Michigan Area—Alma College, Aquinas College, Grand Rapids Bible College, Hope College, and Owosso College.

One other general note should be prefaced to these tables. In those tables which divide the respondents by four academic areas, there is also a fifth category labeled "All Combinations." This category is used for those respondents who place themselves in more than one academic area. For example, an historian might have placed himself in both the humanities and the social sciences or a teacher of the history of science might place himself in every one of the four areas.

Table A-1

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

	College or University	Number Distributed to Faculty	Number of Completed Questionnaires	Percent
1.	Adrian College	75	41	54.7
2.	Albion College	109	43	39.4
3.	Alma College	62	23	37.1
4.	Andrews University	137	73	53.3
5.	Aquinas College	85	32	37.6
6.	Central Michigan University	409	209	51.1
7.	Cleary College	43	1	2.3
8.	Cranbrook Academy	10	1	10.0
9.	Detroit Bible College	24	5	20.8
10.	Detroit College of Business	26	6	23.1
11.	Detroit College of Law	30	2	6.7
12.	Detroit Institute of Technology	113	23	20.4
13.	Eastern Michigan University	650	177	27.2
14.	Ferris State College	275	81	29.8
15.	General Motors Institute	216	72	33.3
16.	Grand Rapids Baptist College	17	5	29.4
17.	Grand Valley State College	63	25	39.7
18.	Hillsdale College	56	6	10.7
19.	Hope College	104	52	50.0
20.	Kalamazoo College	90	29	32.2
21.	Madonna College	30	7	23.3
22.	Maryglade College	5	3	60.0
23.	Marygrove College	80	59	73.8
24.	Mercy College	106	30	28.3
25.	Merrill-Palmer Institute	40	16	40.0
26.	Michigan State University	3,600	1,181	32.8
27.	Michigan Technological University-Houghton	280	151	54.0
28.	Michigan Technological University-Sault Ste. Marie	44	17	38.6
29.	Nazareth College	40	16	40.0
30.	Northern Michigan University	200	24	12.0
31.	Oakland University	83	43	51.8
32.	Olivet College	50	7	14.0

College or University	Number Distributed to Faculty	Number of Completed Questionnaires	Percent
33. Owosso College	15	6	40.0
34. Sacred Heart Novitiate	10	1	10.0
35. Sacred Heart Seminary	25	10	40.0
36. St. John's Provincial Seminary	15	3	20.0
37. Siena Heights College	65	12	18.5
38. Spring Arbor College	31	16	51.6
39. University of Detroit	523	163	31.2
40. University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4,150	1,167	28.2
41. University of Michigan-Dearborn	100	38	38.0
42. University of Michigan-Flint	55	24	43.6
43. Wayne State University	2,000	625	31.2
44. Western Michigan University	828	252	30.4
Others			
45. Detroit area— school not specified		54	
46. Kalamazoo area— school not specified		14	
47. School or area not known		32	
Total	14,969	4,877	32.6

Table A-2

MOST IMPORTANT LIBRARY FOR PROFESSIONAL NEEDS BY SCHOOL

School	Campus Library	Michigan State University	University of Michigan	Wayne State University	Detroit Public Library	Michigan State Library	Personal Library	All Other Michigan Libraries	Out-of-State Libraries	All Others Not Specified	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	82.3	4.8	3.8	0	0.5	0	0	2.9	1.0	0	4.7	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	55.4	0.6	30.5	2.3	0.6	0	1.7	2.8	0.6	1.1	4.4	
Ferris State College	82.7	1.2	2.5	0	0	1.2	0	2.5	2.5	0	7.4	
Grand Valley College	92.0	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	0	0	
Michigan State University	89.0	—	1.2	0	0	0.9	0.3	2.4	0.9	0.5	4.8	
Michigan Tech University	82.8	0	0.6	0.6	0	0.6	1.8	2.4	0	0.6	10.6	
Northern Michigan University	95.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.2	0	0	0	
Oakland University	62.8	4.7	14.0	16.3	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	0	
University of Michigan	93.0	0.1	—	0.2	0.2	0	0.6	1.3	0.6	0.2	3.8	
Wayne State University	82.9	0	2.5	—	6.9	0	0.5	1.8	0.8	1.0	3.6	
Western Michigan University	79.0	0.4	5.6	0.4	0.4	0	1.2	6.0	1.2	0	5.8	
University of Detroit	79.1	0	3.1	3.1	8.0	0.6	1.2	1.2	0	0.6	3.1	
Detroit & Suburban Area	78.7	0.3	3.4	5.9	1.7	0	0.7	2.8	0.3	1.0	5.2	
Southern Michigan Area	80.3	2.3	6.9	0	0.4	0	0.4	1.2	1.9	0.4	6.2	
Central Michigan Area	86.4	4.3	2.5	0	0	0	0	4.3	0.8	0	1.7	
School Unknown	59.4	0	9.4	3.1	6.3	0	0	3.1	0	3.1	15.6	
Total Respondents	84.4	0.6	3.6	0.9	1.4	0.3	0.6	2.2	0.8	0.5	4.7	

Table A-3

MOST IMPORTANT LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC AREA OF SPECIALIZATION

Most Important Library	Area of Specialization				
	Humanities	Social Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	All Combinations
Campus Library	78.9	83.8	87.7	88.6	81.9
Michigan State University	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.7
University of Michigan	5.6	3.9	2.2	2.9	3.7
Wayne State University	1.5	0.8	1.0	0.4	0
Detroit Public Library	1.2	2.6	0.2	1.3	0.7
Michigan State Library	0.5	0.3	0.1	0	1.4
Personal Library	0.1	0.5	1.0	0.8	1.4
All Other Michigan Libraries	3.9	2.0	1.7	1.2	1.4
Out-of-State Libraries	1.4	0.9	0.2	0.4	2.2
All Others, Not Specified	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7
No Answer	5.4	4.1	4.9	3.5	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A-4

MOST IMPORTANT LIBRARY BY TYPE OF RESEARCH

Most Important Library	Type of Research Research for Doctorate	Research for Master's	Research not for Degree	Research not Specified	Not Engaged in Research
Campus Library	78.4	83.1	85.9	83.3	86.3
Michigan State University	2.1	1.3	0.3	0	0.4
University of Michigan	8.8	3.8	3.3	1.0	1.6
Wayne State University	1.4	1.7	0.9	0	0.4
Detroit Public	1.9	3.0	1.0	2.1	1.8
Michigan State Library	0	0.4	0.2	0	0.4
Personal Library	0.3	0.4	0.8	1.0	0.4
All Other Michigan Libraries	2.1	1.7	2.1	3.2	2.3
Out-of-State Libraries	1.4	0	0.8	1.0	0.4
All Others not Specified	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.0	0.6
No Answer	3.2	4.2	4.2	7.4	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A-5

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	12.4	29.2	40.2	14.8	3.4	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	2.3	20.9	48.0	24.8	4.0	
Ferris State College	6.2	29.6	50.6	11.1	2.5	
Grand Valley State College	0	40.0	48.0	12.0	0	
Michigan State University	7.5	42.7	36.0	12.7	1.1	
Michigan Technological University	4.2	33.3	35.7	25.0	1.8	
Northern Michigan University	12.5	37.5	33.3	16.7	0	
Oakland University	2.3	16.3	46.5	34.9	0	
University of Michigan	47.2	37.8	10.1	3.4	1.5	
Wayne State University	15.7	46.7	28.8	6.9	1.9	
Western Michigan University	2.4	21.4	49.2	25.0	2.0	
University of Detroit	14.1	49.2	33.7	2.4	0.6	
Detroit and Suburban Area	23.0	37.5	24.4	11.3	3.8	
Southern Michigan Area	9.3	40.1	36.7	13.1	0.8	
Central Michigan Area	9.3	40.7	33.0	13.6	3.4	
School Unknown	12.5	50.0	28.2	6.2	3.1	
Total Respondents	19.4	38.4	29.4	11.0	1.8	

Table A-6

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY RANK OF TEACHER

Rank	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Full Professor	29.3	40.2	23.8	6.0	0.7	100.0
Associate Professor	18.6	39.4	31.0	10.1	0.9	
Assistant Professor	13.4	36.6	33.2	15.6	1.2	
Instructor (Lecturer)	17.0	33.3	32.7	15.5	1.5	
Research Associate	33.0	45.2	16.7	3.2	1.6	
Graduate Assistant	26.9	49.2	14.8	7.6	4.5	
Total Respondents	19.4	38.4	29.4	11.0	1.8	

Table A-7

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Length of Service	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N.A.	Total
1 Year or Less	13.1	34.9	32.6	17.6	1.8	100.0
Over 1 Year to 3 Years	14.4	37.2	33.9	13.3	1.2	
Over 3 Years to 5 Years	18.5	40.3	29.4	10.5	1.3	
Over 5 Years to 10 Years	23.1	40.0	28.4	7.7	0.8	
Over 10 Years	28.6	42.0	22.3	6.0	1.1	
Total Respondents	19.4	38.4	29.4	11.0	1.8	

Table A-8

FREQUENCY OF USE OF CAMPUS LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Frequency of Use						
	Several Times A Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	Never	No Answer	Total
Humanities	51.3	27.5	12.8	5.9	0.8	1.7	100.0
Social Sciences	39.3	29.0	18.9	10.9	0.3	1.6	
Biological Sciences	34.7	33.6	18.0	10.9	1.0	1.8	
Physical Sciences	32.6	32.2	19.5	13.1	1.0	1.6	
All Combinations	43.5	22.5	18.8	13.0	0	2.2	
Total Respondents	39.2	30.3	17.5	10.5	0.8	1.7	

Table A-9

FREQUENCY OF USE OF CAMPUS LIBRARY BY TYPE OF RESEARCH

Type of Research	Frequency of Use						
	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	Never	No Answer	Total
Research for Doctorate	49.1	32.0	12.6	4.0	0.4	1.9	100.0
Research for Master's	56.4	25.4	10.2	7.2	0.4	0.4	
Research, but Not for Degree	40.9	30.5	17.3	9.5	0.7	1.1	
Research, Not Specified	39.6	24.0	21.8	10.4	0	4.2	
Not Engaged in Research	27.1	29.2	22.7	17.4	1.2	2.4	
Total Respondents	39.2	30.3	17.5	10.5	0.8	1.7	

Table A-10

NEED FOR ACCESS TO STACKS BY ACADEMIC AREA

	Access to Stacks				
Academic Area	Essential	Worthwhile	Incidental	No Answer	Total
Humanities	73.9	20.3	4.7	1.1	100.0
Social Sciences	65.1	28.0	6.0	0.9	
Biological Sciences	69.6	24.6	5.2	0.6	
Physical Sciences	61.3	29.0	8.8	0.9	
All Combinations	70.3	23.9	5.8	0	
Total Respondents	66.3	25.9	6.5	1.3	

Table A-11

NEED FOR ACCESS TO STACKS BY TYPE OF RESEARCH

Type of Research	Access to Stacks				
	Essential	Worthwhile	Incidental	No Answer	Total
Research for Doctorate	73.6	23.5	1.9	1.0	100.0
Research for Master's	66.1	27.1	5.5	1.3	
Research, but not for Degree	72.3	21.8	5.3	0.6	
Research, not Specified	72.9	19.8	6.3	1.0	
Not Engaged in Research	50.2	36.3	11.7	1.8	
Total Respondents	66.3	25.9	6.5	1.3	

Table A-12

OTHER MICHIGAN LIBRARIES USED BY AT LEAST 25 RESPONDENTS*

Library	Number of Respondents Using Library
Public	
Ann Arbor	325
Big Rapids City	25
East Lansing	152
Flint	52
Grand Rapids	41
Herrick (Holland)	35
Houghton	26
Kalamazoo	153
Lansing	59
Mount Pleasant	47
Ypsilanti	29
Colleges and Universities	
Kalamazoo College	41
University of Detroit	80
University of Michigan-Flint	28
Western Michigan University	40
Special	
Upjohn Company	30
Personal	25

---

* Exclusive of largest libraries in state, for which see Chapter I, Table 4 and accompanying text.

Table A-13

MICHIGAN LIBRARY WITH BEST COLLECTION IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY ACADEMIC AREA

	Academic Area				
Best Library for Specialization Field	Humanities	Social Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	All Combinations
Michigan State University	2.6	8.1	14.2	4.3	8.0
University of Michigan	63.0	50.0	48.6	50.3	48.5
Wayne State University	3.1	4.1	2.7	3.2	6.5
Detroit Public Library	2.0	1.6	0.1	1.3	0.7
Michigan State Library	0.8	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.7
Personal Library	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.7
All Other Michigan Libraries	2.7	1.8	1.1	2.9	3.6
All Out-of-State Libraries	0.8	1.1	1.5	0.9	0
Others, Not Specified	9.3	18.2	17.5	19.7	14.6
No Answer	15.5	14.0	13.8	17.2	16.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A-14

MICHIGAN LIBRARY WITH BEST COLLECTION IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY TYPE OF RESEARCH

	Type of Research				
Best Library for Specialization Field	Research for Doctorate	Research for Master's	Research, Not for Degree	Research, Not Specified	Not Engaged in Research
Michigan State University	8.3	9.3	7.1	2.1	6.8
University of Michigan	53.9	40.7	58.2	62.6	40.0
Wayne State University	3.8	2.1	3.5	3.1	3.3
Detroit Public Library	0.6	3.8	1.0	1.0	1.9
Michigan State Library	0.4	1.3	0.4	0	0.7
Personal Library	0.1	0	0.3	0	0.2
All Other Michigan Libraries	1.9	2.5	1.7	3.1	3.5
All Out-of-State Libraries	0.6	0.4	1.0	3.1	1.2
Others, Not Specified	16.7	20.8	15.2	12.5	18.5
No Answer	13.7	19.1	11.6	12.5	23.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table A-15

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICE—FREQUENCY OF USE AND ADEQUACY OF SERVICE BY SCHOOL

School	Frequency					Adequacy						
	Often	Occasionally	Never	N.A.	Total	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	N.A.	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	6.2	50.2	38.8	4.8	100.0	13.4	24.9	13.9	5.3	32.0	10.5	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	2.8	37.9	55.9	3.4		1.7	18.1	9.6	9.0	51.4	10.2	
Ferris State College	11.1	38.3	44.4	6.2		22.2	14.8	8.6	3.7	30.9	19.8	
Grand Valley State College	28.0	44.0	24.0	4.0		24.0	28.0	12.0	0	32.0	4.0	
Michigan State Univ.	9.8	55.6	32.7	1.9		10.8	30.7	13.3	5.6	31.4	8.2	
Michigan Tech Univ.	14.9	52.3	29.8	3.0		11.3	35.1	13.1	6.0	28.5	6.0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	16.7	58.3	25.0	0		0	54.2	12.5	8.3	20.8	4.2	
Oakland Univ.	11.6	65.2	20.9	2.3		16.3	37.2	18.6	4.7	20.9	2.3	
Univ. of Michigan	8.9	60.4	29.0	1.7		19.4	34.3	10.0	4.6	25.4	6.3	
Wayne State Univ.	13.3	50.2	34.7	1.8		16.5	29.0	12.1	3.2	32.0	7.2	
Western Michigan Univ.	8.3	57.6	31.3	2.8		8.3	31.4	14.3	7.5	30.6	7.9	
Univ. of Detroit	9.8	52.8	33.7	3.7		22.7	32.5	7.4	3.1	25.1	9.2	
Detroit & Suburban Area	10.3	43.9	38.2	7.6		19.6	31.6	6.5	3.4	27.6	11.3	
Southern Michigan Area	7.7	51.0	36.7	4.6		14.3	34.4	11.1	5.8	24.7	9.7	
Central Michigan Area	5.1	52.6	36.4	5.9		18.6	35.6	12.7	3.4	21.2	8.5	
School Unknown	15.6	43.7	31.3	9.4		6.3	31.2	12.5	6.3	18.7	25.0	
Total Respondents	9.7	53.8	33.6	2.9		14.9	31.2	11.5	5.0	29.2	8.2	

Table A-16

INTERLIBRARY LOAN
REASONS FOR RATING SERVICE AS FAIR OR POOR

Reason	Percent of Respondents Rating Fair or Poor
Slowness of Service	53.9
No Service Available	11.1
Cannot Borrow All Materials	5.1
Inadequate Personnel	4.5
Lack of Information About Available Service	3.7
Cannot Borrow from Every Library	2.8
Costs Too High	2.4
Cannot Keep Materials Long Enough	2.0
No Reason Given	14.5
	100.0

Table A-17

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE—FREQUENCY OF USE AND ADEQUACY OF SERVICE BY SCHOOL

	Frequency					Adequacy						
School	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	22.5	54.1	17.2	6.2	100.0	19.6	36.8	15.3	6.2	12.0	10.1	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	19.8	47.5	28.3	4.4		6.2	26.6	18.1	14.1	27.7	7.3	
Ferris State College	11.1	35.8	45.7	7.4		7.4	21.0	12.4	11.1	29.6	18.5	
Grand Valley State College	16.0	64.0	16.0	4.0		40.0	32.0	4.0	0	24.0	0	
Michigan State Univ.	30.6	49.0	17.6	2.8		17.9	40.7	13.5	6.3	13.5	8.1	
Michigan Tech Univ.	28.0	33.9	31.5	6.6		13.1	28.0	7.7	14.3	29.8	7.1	
Northern Michigan Univ.	12.5	45.8	37.5	4.2		4.2	25.0	16.7	16.7	20.7	16.7	
Oakland Univ.	39.5	51.1	4.7	4.7		34.8	44.1	7.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	
Univ. of Michigan	28.7	49.9	18.2	3.2		25.1	38.7	9.5	5.7	14.7	6.3	
Wayne State Univ.	35.2	48.0	13.9	2.9		21.0	38.7	14.4	7.5	11.7	6.7	
Western Michigan Univ.	33.7	50.8	12.7	2.8		30.6	42.5	9.1	3.2	9.1	5.5	
Univ. of Detroit	36.2	47.2	13.5	3.1		38.0	35.0	9.8	4.3	8.0	4.9	
Detroit & Suburban Area	32.0	43.3	19.2	5.5		35.9	27.4	6.9	7.2	11.3	11.3	
Southern Michigan Area	22.4	48.3	22.7	6.6		19.3	34.4	9.7	13.5	12.7	10.4	
Central Michigan Area	17.8	44.1	27.1	11.0		8.5	22.9	10.2	23.7	17.0	17.7	
School Unknown	25.0	43.7	25.0	6.3		18.7	31.3	12.5	6.3	12.5	18.7	
Total Respondents	29.1	48.2	18.8	3.9		21.9	36.7	11.5	7.6	14.3	8.0	

Table A-18

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE REASONS FOR RATING FAIR OR POOR

Reason	Percent of Respondents Rating Fair or Poor
Waiting Period Too Long to Use Machines	23.8
Costs	22.8
Restricted Access to Machines	11.6
Have No or Unsatisfactory Equipment	10.6
Copies Are Too Poor	6.4
Machines Frequently Out of Order	4.3
Cannot Copy All Types of Materials	2.6
Inadequate Personnel	2.2
No Reason Given	15.7
	100.0

Table A-19

MICROFILM READERS/PRINTERS—FREQUENCY OF USE AND ADEQUACY OF SERVICE BY SCHOOL

	Frequency					Adequacy						
School	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	7.2	44.5	41.1	7.2	100.0	5.3	31.6	10.5	3.3	28.7	20.6	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	5.1	38.4	53.1	3.4		4.5	26.0	6.2	6.2	41.3	15.8	
Ferris State College	1.2	13.6	71.6	13.6		1.3	7.4	3.7	14.8	37.0	35.8	
Grand Valley State College	8.0	64.0	24.0	4.0		24.0	40.0	0	4.0	16.0	16.0	
Michigan State Univ.	5.1	38.0	53.0	3.9		5.4	26.0	6.9	1.9	36.6	23.2	
Michigan Tech Univ.	1.2	28.6	63.7	6.5		3.6	12.5	10.7	12.5	44.6	16.1	
Northern Michigan Univ.	16.7	50.0	29.2	4.1		8.3	33.3	25.0	0	25.0	8.3	
Oakland Univ.	18.6	37.2	39.5	4.7		7.0	32.6	9.3	7.0	30.2	13.9	
Univ. of Michigan	5.0	45.3	46.2	3.5		12.1	32.5	3.7	3.0	30.1	18.6	
Wayne State Univ.	3.8	43.2	49.3	3.7		5.6	27.0	6.9	2.1	36.5	21.9	
Western Michigan Univ.	5.9	49.6	40.1	4.4		5.2	31.0	8.7	5.2	34.8	15.1	
Univ. of Detroit	4.3	36.8	51.5	7.4		9.8	25.8	6.1	1.8	33.2	23.3	
Detroit & Suburban Area	2.4	34.7	55.0	7.9		13.4	22.3	4.5	8.6	27.8	23.4	
Southern Michigan Area	4.2	32.4	55.2	8.2		6.9	22.4	4.6	9.3	33.2	23.6	
Central Michigan Area	3.4	44.1	44.1	8.4		3.4	33.9	10.2	5.1	22.9	24.5	
School Unknown	9.4	31.2	50.0	9.4		6.3	28.1	3.1	3.1	21.9	37.5	
Total Respondents	4.8	40.4	49.9	4.9		7.7	27.4	6.2	4.1	33.6	21.0	

Table A-20

MICROFILM READERS/PRINTERS
REASONS FOR RATING FAIR OR POOR

Reason	Percent of Respondents Rating Fair or Poor
Waiting Period for Machines Too Long	20.9
Inadequate Facilities Other Than Machines	15.5
Inadequate Collection of Films	13.1
Have No or Unsatisfactory Equipment	12.5
Prints Are Hard to Read	5.3
Machines Frequently Out of Order	4.3
Restricted Access to Machines	2.8
Costs	0.6
No Reason Given	25.0
	100.0

Table A-21

FREQUENCY OF USE OF SELECTED LIBRARY SERVICES BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Interlibrary Loan					Photoduplication Service					Microfilm Readers/Printers				
	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total
Humanities	11.7	52.1	33.1	3.1	100.0	24.9	52.4	18.2	4.5	100.0	9.6	46.0	38.6	5.8	100.0
Social Sciences	7.3	54.9	35.2	2.6		31.2	47.1	18.7	3.0		5.8	46.7	43.5	4.0	
Biological Sciences	13.2	59.3	26.4	1.1		29.4	51.3	17.2	2.1		1.1	32.6	62.5	3.8	
Physical Sciences	8.1	52.2	38.1	1.6		31.7	44.8	19.6	3.9		1.8	36.3	58.6	3.3	
All Combinations	11.6	53.6	31.9	2.9		34.0	50.0	13.8	2.2		7.2	44.9	44.9	3.0	
Total Respondents	9.7	53.8	33.6	2.9		29.1	48.2	18.8	3.9		4.8	40.4	49.9	4.9	

Table A-22

FREQUENCY OF USE OF SELECTED LIBRARY SERVICES BY TYPE OF RESEARCH

Type of Research	Interlibrary Loan					Photoduplication Service					Microfilm Readers/Printers				
	Often	Occa-sionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Often	Occa-sionally	Never	No Answer	Total	Often	Occa-sionally	Never	No Answer	Total
Research for Doctorate	11.6	50.5	36.0	1.9	100.0	35.7	46.1	15.2	3.0	100.0	7.1	40.2	48.6	4.1	100.0
Research for Master's	8.1	36.8	52.1	3.0		32.2	52.1	14.0	1.7		5.5	32.2	58.5	3.8	
Research, but Not for Degree	12.1	63.2	23.6	1.1		34.1	48.2	14.8	2.9		5.8	47.3	43.8	3.1	
Research, Not Specified	8.3	55.2	30.2	6.3		18.7	61.4	15.7	4.2		4.2	46.9	42.7	6.2	
Not Engaged in Research	3.6	40.8	51.1	4.5		15.7	48.9	30.4	5.0		1.3	28.8	63.5	6.4	
Total Respondents	9.7	53.8	33.6	2.9		29.1	48.2	18.8	3.9		4.8	40.4	49.9	4.9	

Table A-23

USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS BY ACADEMIC AREA

	Frequency				
Academic Area	Often	Occasionally	Never	No Answer	Total
A. Periodicals					
Humanities	74.6	22.1	1.1	2.2	100.0
Social Sciences	82.2	17.0	0.3	0.5	
Biological Sciences	90.8	8.9	0.2	0.1	
Physical Sciences	78.6	19.9	1.0	0.5	
All Combinations	81.9	15.9	0.8	1.4	
Total Respondents	80.4	17.4	0.7	1.5	
B. Monographs					
Humanities	34.8	38.7	14.0	12.5	100.0
Social Sciences	43.3	44.7	6.5	5.5	
Biological Sciences	35.8	48.0	8.9	7.3	
Physical Sciences	32.3	44.7	15.6	7.4	
All Combinations	40.6	38.4	9.4	11.6	
Total Respondents	36.6	43.6	11.0	8.8	
C. Government Documents					
Humanities	6.1	28.2	45.7	20.0	100.0
Social Sciences	31.0	52.2	11.1	5.7	
Biological Sciences	15.2	52.5	21.8	10.5	
Physical Sciences	21.0	46.8	24.2	8.0	
All Combinations	27.5	42.8	15.9	13.8	
Total Respondents	19.5	45.1	24.1	11.3	
D. Manuscripts					
Humanities	11.7	42.3	31.4	14.6	100.0
Social Sciences	10.4	49.5	30.2	9.9	
Biological Sciences	8.7	48.1	32.3	10.9	
Physical Sciences	5.4	41.4	42.8	10.4	
All Combinations	10.1	42.0	32.6	15.3	
Total Respondents	9.1	44.9	33.8	12.2	
E. Recordings, Tapes, etc.					
Humanities	21.5	37.4	30.7	10.4	100.0
Social Sciences	11.1	36.2	44.3	8.4	
Biological Sciences	5.5	30.4	54.5	9.6	
Physical Sciences	3.2	20.3	65.9	10.6	
All Combinations	14.5	34.8	37.0	13.7	
Total Respondents	10.5	31.8	47.4	10.3	

Table A-24

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: DEPTH OF COLLECTION IN FIELDS TAUGHT BY RESPONDENT, BY SCHOOL

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	14.8	38.8	34.7	9.1	2.6	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	4.3	28.1	50.0	15.9	1.7	
Ferris State College	8.6	43.2	30.9	12.4	4.9	
Grand Valley State College	8.0	56.0	28.0	4.0	4.0	
Michigan State University	12.3	47.6	29.6	7.3	3.2	
Michigan Tech University	6.9	32.6	36.8	20.8	2.9	
Northern Michigan University	20.8	54.2	16.7	8.3	0	
Oakland University	2.4	34.1	39.1	24.4	0	
University of Michigan	44.6	38.8	11.4	2.8	2.4	
Wayne State University	19.2	50.2	23.6	4.6	2.4	
Western Michigan University	9.4	31.4	43.4	14.5	1.3	
University of Detroit	18.2	45.4	30.8	2.8	2.8	
Detroit & Suburban Area	19.5	45.9	24.1	6.4	4.1	
Southern Michigan Area	10.9	49.1	27.1	10.4	2.5	
Central Michigan Area	12.8	38.4	41.9	4.3	2.6	
School Unknown	0	61.9	33.3	4.8	0	
Total Respondents	19.3	42.8	27.6	7.7	2.6	

Table A-25

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: GENERAL BREADTH OF COLLECTION IN CAMPUS LIBRARY

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	13.8	43.3	33.1	7.3	2.5	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	2.4	32.3	51.3	12.8	1.2	
Ferris State College	6.2	43.2	38.3	7.4	4.9	
Grand Valley State College	20.0	48.0	28.0	0	4.0	
Michigan State University	12.2	50.1	28.9	5.3	3.5	
Michigan Tech University	6.9	34.0	35.4	19.5	4.2	
Northern Michigan University	12.5	41.7	37.5	8.3	0	
Oakland University	2.4	26.9	51.2	19.5	0	
University of Michigan	49.4	37.4	9.3	1.1	2.8	
Wayne State University	18.4	54.2	20.8	4.4	2.2	
Western Michigan University	7.2	35.3	44.4	11.8	1.3	
University of Detroit	15.4	55.2	24.5	2.1	2.8	
Detroit & Suburban Area	17.7	45.1	25.9	6.8	4.5	
Southern Michigan Area	10.4	50.9	32.1	3.7	2.9	
Central Michigan Area	11.1	45.3	36.7	4.3	2.6	
School Unknown	0	57.1	38.1	4.8	0	
Total Respondents	19.4	44.7	27.2	5.8	2.9	

Table A-26

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: AVAILABILITY OF MULTIPLE COPIES IN CAMPUS LIBRARY

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	4.1	19.4	39.8	32.2	4.5	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	0.6	12.2	34.2	50.6	2.4	
Ferris State College	0	16.0	34.6	43.2	6.2	
Grand Valley State College	4.0	32.0	52.0	12.0	0	
Michigan State University	2.3	17.7	39.0	35.9	5.1	
Michigan Tech University	0	8.3	21.6	66.7	3.4	
Northern Michigan University	0	4.2	37.5	58.3	0	
Oakland University	2.4	7.3	26.8	61.1	2.4	
University of Michigan	13.2	35.7	34.5	13.8	2.8	
Wayne State University	6.0	21.7	44.2	24.1	4.0	
Western Michigan University	2.1	10.6	42.6	41.3	3.4	
University of Detroit	6.3	20.3	42.6	28.0	2.8	
Detroit & Suburban Area	7.5	21.1	38.3	27.8	5.3	
Southern Michigan Area	2.5	19.6	42.5	30.8	4.6	
Central Michigan Area	0	20.5	41.0	35.9	2.6	
School Unknown	0	23.8	28.6	42.8	4.8	
Total Respondents	5.2	21.2	38.3	31.4	3.9	

Table A-27

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: CAMPUS LIBRARY, DEPTH OF COLLECTION IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Humanities	18.2	42.1	28.5	9.1	2.1	100.0
Social Sciences	16.2	41.1	31.9	9.1	1.7	
Biological Sciences	25.8	42.1	23.8	6.3	2.0	
Physical Sciences	22.3	46.3	23.9	4.6	2.9	
All Combinations	14.4	48.1	26.0	11.5		
Total Respondents	19.3	42.8	27.6	7.7	2.6	

Table A-28

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: AVAILABILITY OF MULTIPLE COPIES IN CAMPUS LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Humanities	5.2	23.3	34.7	33.9	2.9	100.0
Social Sciences	6.8	19.9	39.2	31.5	2.6	
Biological Sciences	3.9	23.1	41.9	27.6	3.5	
Physical Sciences	5.0	20.4	39.6	30.1	4.9	
All Combinations	1.9	21.2	39.4	36.5	1.0	
Total Respondents	5.2	21.2	38.3	31.4	3.9	

Table A-29

LIBRARIES (OTHER THAN CAMPUS LIBRARY) MOST USED BY UNDERGRADUATES

Library	Most Used (in order of rank)	Second Most Used	Third Most Used
Detroit Public	1	1	1
University of Michigan	2	3	2
Michigan State Library	3	6	7
Wayne State University	4	2	3
Michigan State University	5	4	4
Kalamazoo Public	6	10	11
Kalamazoo College	7	6	11
University of Detroit	7	5	5
Grand Rapids Public	7	14	11
Out-of-State Libraries	10	6	6
Ann Arbor Public	11	14	8
Western Michigan University	12	17	10
Flint Public	13	16	17
All Business Libraries	14	13	15
East Lansing Public	15	11	8
Calvin College	16	12	15
Lansing Public	17	9	11

Table A-30

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: TAILORING OF READING LISTS TO CAMPUS MATERIALS

School	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	65.3	11.7	19.4	3.6	100.0	17.2	57.1	19.5	5.4	0.8	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	55.5	20.1	23.2	1.2		4.4	55.0	29.6	11.0	0	
Ferris State College	58.0	11.1	24.7	6.2		10.6	72.4	14.9	2.1	0	
Grand Valley State College	72.0	16.0	12.0	0		22.2	72.2	5.6	0	0	
Michigan State Univ.	54.5	19.2	24.0	2.3		10.5	59.0	23.8	5.1	1.6	
Michigan Tech Univ.	45.1	11.1	42.4	1.4		6.1	53.9	23.1	12.3	4.6	
Northern Michigan Univ.	79.1	4.2	12.5	4.2		26.3	63.2	10.5	0	0	
Oakland Univ.	68.3	9.7	22.0	0		7.1	53.6	25.0	10.7	3.6	
Univ. of Michigan	53.4	27.3	16.9	2.4		35.9	53.3	8.7	1.3	0.8	
Wayne State Univ.	49.7	18.6	28.6	3.1		18.3	57.4	19.5	4.0	0.8	
Western Michigan Univ.	62.2	20.8	15.7	1.3		6.9	56.1	29.4	6.2	1.4	
Univ. of Detroit	55.2	24.5	16.1	4.2		19.0	68.4	8.8	2.5	1.3	
Detroit & Suburban Area	62.0	14.7	17.7	5.6		21.8	58.2	17.6	1.8	0.6	
Southern Michigan Area	68.4	12.9	16.2	2.5		12.8	63.5	19.5	2.4	1.8	
Central Michigan Area	77.8	10.2	9.4	2.6		12.0	55.0	27.5	5.5	0	
School Unknown	61.9	23.8	14.3	0		23.1	53.9	15.4	0	7.6	
Total Respondents	57.2	19.0	21.1	2.7		17.4	57.9	19.3	4.2	1.2	

Table A-31

UNDERGRADUATE NEEDS: TAILORING OF READING LISTS TO CAMPUS MATERIALS BY ACADEMIC AREA

	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
Academic Area	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Humanities	63.3	17.2	17.7	1.8	100.0	17.1	58.5	18.9	3.8	1.7	100.0
Social Sciences	63.1	23.1	11.8	2.0		14.7	54.0	24.8	5.9	0.6	
Biological Sciences	59.4	19.2	18.6	2.8		18.0	64.0	13.4	3.4	1.2	
Physical Sciences	41.9	17.1	38.3	2.7		24.3	57.5	14.3	2.5	1.4	
All Combinations	65.3	18.4	16.3	0		11.8	54.5	27.9	2.9	2.9	
Total Respondents	57.2	19.0	21.1	2.7		17.4	57.9	19.3	4.2	1.2	

Table A-32

UNDERGRADUATE USE OF OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARIES REQUIRED FOR COURSE WORK OR TERM PAPERS AND SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS

	Course Work				Term Papers and Special Assignments			
School	Yes	No	No Answer	Total	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	10.7	88.3	1.0	100.0	26.5	70.9	2.6	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	21.3	75.7	3.0		42.7	54.9	2.4	
Ferris State College	11.1	82.7	6.2		19.8	71.6	8.6	
Grand Valley State College	16.0	80.0	4.0		48.0	52.0	0	
Michigan State Univ.	9.8	88.1	2.1		22.2	75.3	2.5	
Michigan Tech Univ.	8.3	88.9	2.8		20.1	77.1	2.8	
Northern Michigan Univ.	8.4	91.6	0		33.3	66.7	0	
Oakland Univ.	26.8	70.8	2.4		51.2	48.8	0	
Univ. of Michigan	9.7	89.2	1.1		16.7	81.3	2.0	
Wayne State Univ.	26.5	71.3	2.2		43.8	52.9	3.3	
Western Michigan Univ.	11.9	85.1	3.0		37.4	59.6	3.0	
Univ. of Detroit	27.2	71.4	1.4		62.2	35.7	2.1	
Detroit & Suburban Area	28.9	66.9	4.2		56.0	40.6	3.4	
Southern Michigan Area	15.4	81.3	3.3		49.2	47.1	3.7	
Central Michigan Area	11.1	87.2	1.7		53.0	43.6	3.4	
School Unknown	33.3	66.7	0		47.7	42.8	9.5	
Total Respondents	15.4	82.4	2.2		33.3	63.9	2.8	

Table A-33

UNDERGRADUATE USE OF OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARIES REQUIRED FOR COURSE WORK OR OTHER ASSIGNMENTS BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Course Work				Term Papers and Special Assignments			
	Yes	No	No Answer	Total	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Humanities	16.7	80.7	2.6	100.0	37.3	59.9	2.8	100.0
Social Sciences	19.7	78.1	2.2		41.0	56.8	2.2	
Biological Sciences	12.4	86.1	1.5		31.4	66.7	2.0	
Physical Sciences	9.9	88.3	1.8		20.9	75.7	3.4	
All Combinations	22.1	74.1	3.8		41.3	55.8	2.9	
Total Respondents	15.4	82.4	2.2		33.3	63.9	2.8	

Table A-34

FUTURE UNDERGRADUATE USE OF SELECTED LIBRARY MATERIALS BY ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	More	Same	Less	No Need Now or in Future	No Answer	Total
A. Periodicals						
Humanities	51.4	40.7	1.4	3.1	3.4	100.0
Social Sciences	61.8	33.6	1.5	0.8	2.3	
Biological Sciences	63.6	31.0	0.4	3.3	1.7	
Physical Sciences	47.0	37.3	0.4	11.5	3.8	
All Combinations	66.3	27.9	1.0	2.9	1.9	
Total Respondents	55.7	35.8	1.0	4.5	3.0	
B. Monographs						
Humanities	21.4	45.6	1.8	18.7	12.5	100.0
Social Sciences	28.6	53.6	3.6	7.2	7.0	
Biological Sciences	24.9	50.9	2.2	12.0	10.0	
Physical Sciences	22.5	46.6	1.6	21.2	8.1	
All Combinations	34.6	42.3	2.9	12.5	7.7	
Total Respondents	24.5	48.8	2.4	14.8	9.5	
C. Government Documents						
Humanities	7.6	29.9	1.4	42.1	19.0	100.0
Social Sciences	29.3	47.9	2.5	12.5	7.8	
Biological Sciences	12.7	44.8	3.0	26.9	12.6	
Physical Sciences	14.0	41.2	1.8	34.4	8.6	
All Combinations	25.0	42.3	1.9	17.3	13.5	
Total Respondents	17.0	40.6	2.1	28.1	12.2	
D. Manuscripts						
Humanities	9.6	34.0	2.0	37.3	17.1	100.0
Social Sciences	11.8	47.3	4.2	25.2	11.5	
Biological Sciences	9.4	41.7	3.9	31.4	13.6	
Physical Sciences	5.8	38.4	2.6	41.3	11.9	
All Combinations	7.7	41.3	2.9	29.8	18.3	
Total Respondents	9.4	40.4	3.1	33.3	13.8	
E. Recordings, Tapes, etc.						
Humanities	39.1	29.7	1.1	19.6	10.5	100.0
Social Sciences	28.9	33.9	2.4	24.1	10.7	
Biological Sciences	33.0	25.4	2.4	27.5	11.7	
Physical Sciences	17.8	28.2	1.3	40.8	11.9	
All Combinations	38.5	26.9	1.9	21.2	11.5	
Total Respondents	30.4	29.7	1.8	26.9	11.2	

Table A-35

DEPTH OF CAMPUS LIBRARY COLLECTION IN FIELDS YOU TEACH FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' NEEDS

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	7.8	28.4	46.2	17.6	0	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	1.1	19.1	49.5	30.3	0	
Michigan State University	6.9	40.1	39.8	11.8	1.4	
Michigan Technological University	0	33.3	48.5	18.2	0	
Northern Michigan University	0	35.3	35.3	29.4	0	
Oakland University	0	7.1	35.8	50.0	7.1	
University of Michigan	51.2	34.2	10.6	2.6	1.4	
Wayne State University	14.8	46.4	28.5	9.1	1.2	
Western Michigan University	1.9	18.9	47.7	30.2	1.3	
University of Detroit	11.4	50.0	33.0	4.5	1.1	
Detroit and Suburban Area	28.6	47.2	15.7	1.4	7.1	
Southern Michigan Area	3.6	52.7	30.9	7.3	5.5	
Central Michigan Area	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	
School Unknown	25.0	35.0	35.0	5.0	0	
Total Respondents	22.6	36.7	28.8	10.4	1.5	

Table A-36

GENERAL BREADTH OF CAMPUS LIBRARY COLLECTION FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' NEEDS

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	9.8	33.3	42.2	14.7	0	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	1.1	23.6	43.8	31.5	0	
Michigan State University	6.1	44.1	37.2	10.9	1.7	
Michigan Technological University	0	31.8	54.6	12.1	1.5	
Northern Michigan University	0	29.4	41.2	29.4	0	
Oakland University	0	14.3	35.7	42.9	7.1	
University of Michigan	53.2	35.1	8.5	1.8	1.4	
Wayne State University	14.8	48.5	28.2	7.0	1.5	
Western Michigan University	1.3	21.4	50.2	25.8	1.3	
University of Detroit	6.8	54.6	34.1	3.4	1.1	
Detroit and Suburban Area	25.8	50.0	15.7	1.4	7.1	
Southern Michigan Area	9.1	54.5	21.8	9.1	5.5	
Central Michigan Area	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	
School Unknown	20.0	45.0	35.0	0	0	
Total Respondents	22.9	39.3	27.2	9.0	1.6	

Table A-37

AVAILABILITY OF MULTIPLE COPIES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' NEEDS IN CAMPUS LIBRARY

School	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	2.9	18.6	41.3	33.3	3.9	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	0	5.6	32.6	60.7	1.1	
Michigan State University	0.9	19.6	41.0	34.7	3.8	
Michigan Technological University	0	9.1	28.8	59.1	3.0	
Northern Michigan University	5.9	0	23.5	70.6	0	
Oakland University	0	7.1	21.4	64.4	7.1	
University of Michigan	12.1	31.1	37.7	15.9	3.2	
Wayne State University	3.9	21.5	40.7	30.9	3.0	
Western Michigan University	1.9	14.5	33.3	47.2	3.1	
University of Detroit	3.4	19.3	39.8	34.1	3.4	
Detroit and Suburban Area	8.6	37.1	27.1	20.0	7.2	
Southern Michigan Area	5.5	16.4	41.8	27.3	9.0	
Central Michigan Area	0	16.7	33.3	50.0	0	
School Unknown	5.0	20.0	45.0	30.0	0	
Total Respondents	5.6	22.6	38.0	30.2	3.6	

Table A-38

ADEQUACY OF CAMPUS LIBRARY FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' NEEDS BY FIELD OF STUDY

	A					B					C					
	Depth of Collection in Fields You Teach					General Breadth of Collection					Availability of Multiple Copies					
Field of Study	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total of Each Section
Humanities																
Fine Arts	15.7	39.3	33.8	10.1	1.1	20.2	36.0	32.6	10.1	1.1	5.6	24.8	30.2	36.0	3.4	100.0
English, Speech	14.6	27.8	41.7	14.6	1.3	17.4	31.2	35.4	13.9	2.1	3.5	21.6	38.9	34.7	1.3	
Foreign Languages	25.0	35.0	25.0	13.3	1.7	25.0	36.7	26.7	11.6	0	3.3	8.4	40.0	45.0	3.3	
Philosophy, Religion	14.7	50.0	29.5	2.9	2.9	17.6	53.0	20.6	5.9	2.9	8.8	23.5	38.2	29.5	0	
All Others	0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0	5.0	30.0	50.0	15.0	0	0	10.0	45.0	45.0	0	
Social Sciences																
Business, Economics	13.4	33.9	39.8	11.5	1.4	12.2	41.7	33.9	10.9	1.3	6.4	20.5	37.9	33.3	1.9	
Education	17.9	44.3	28.1	8.9	0.8	18.7	45.6	26.8	7.7	1.2	4.9	26.0	43.5	23.6	2.0	
Geography	9.4	31.3	28.1	31.2	0	9.4	40.6	28.1	21.9	0	0	3.1	43.7	46.9	6.3	
History, Law, and Political Science	26.8	25.6	29.8	17.3	0.5	30.4	23.2	32.7	13.1	0.6	5.9	25.0	34.6	32.1	2.4	
Psychology	24.8	33.9	29.7	9.9	1.7	20.7	43.8	25.6	7.4	2.5	6.6	19.8	38.0	33.9	1.7	
Anthropology and Sociology	13.6	36.4	37.1	12.9	0	15.7	38.5	33.6	12.2	0	2.1	18.6	33.6	45.0	0.7	
All Others	21.4	32.6	27.0	15.9	2.1	22.4	36.1	29.2	11.2	1.1	5.6	27.0	38.2	27.0	2.2	
Biological Sciences																
Agriculture, Forestry	19.6	47.9	28.2	4.3	0	10.9	56.5	30.4	2.2	0	0	34.8	39.1	23.9	2.2	
Biochemistry	28.0	34.0	22.0	16.0	0	26.0	38.0	24.0	12.0	0	6.0	24.0	34.0	34.0	2.0	
Biology, Botany, and Zoology	28.3	34.8	30.4	6.5	0	23.9	43.5	21.7	10.9	0	6.5	15.2	43.6	30.4	4.3	
Health Fields, Physiology	45.7	35.0	13.2	4.1	2.0	44.1	38.1	13.2	2.1	2.5	11.7	29.9	38.5	15.7	4.2	
Home Economics	11.5	46.2	26.9	15.4	0	15.4	50.0	19.2	15.4	0	7.7	15.4	46.1	30.8	0	
All Others	28.6	43.8	20.9	6.7	0	30.9	43.8	18.0	7.3	0	6.2	26.4	35.4	28.1	3.9	
Physical Sciences																
Chemistry	20.5	45.5	28.4	5.6	0	19.3	47.8	25.0	7.9	0	4.5	17.1	44.3	30.7	3.4	
Earth Sciences	18.2	40.9	27.3	13.6	0	18.2	50.0	22.7	9.1	0	4.5	18.2	45.5	31.8	0	
Engineering	18.2	39.6	33.1	9.1	0	18.2	38.3	32.5	9.7	1.3	3.3	20.1	44.1	28.6	3.9	
Mathematics	33.0	40.0	22.6	4.4	0	29.5	43.5	23.5	3.5	0	6.1	24.3	40.0	27.0	2.6	
Physics	18.7	33.3	29.3	18.7	0	16.7	29.2	39.6	14.5	0	2.1	18.7	29.2	41.7	8.3	
All Others	32.7	30.6	24.5	10.2	2.0	32.7	36.7	24.5	4.1	2.0	14.3	28.6	22.5	26.5	8.1	
Total	22.6	36.7	28.8	10.4	1.5	22.9	39.3	27.2	9.0	1.6	5.6	22.6	38.0	30.2	3.6	

Table A-39

EXPECTATION THAT GRADUATE STUDENTS WILL USE LIBRARY RESOURCES OTHER THAN CAMPUS LIBRARY BY SCHOOL

	A			B			C			
	Courses and Seminar Work			Term Papers and Special Assignments			Theses and Dissertations			
School	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Total for Each Section
Central Michigan Univ.	41.2	49.0	9.8	50.0	41.2	8.8	63.7	19.6	16.7	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	69.6	30.4	0	70.7	27.0	2.3	56.2	23.6	20.2	
Michigan State Univ.	31.8	63.5	4.7	40.8	53.5	5.7	71.9	20.7	7.4	
Michigan Tech Univ.	24.3	72.7	3.0	36.4	59.1	4.5	66.7	30.3	3.0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	23.5	70.6	5.9	29.4	58.8	11.8	64.8	17.6	17.6	
Oakland Univ.	50.0	42.9	7.1	71.5	21.4	7.1	78.6	7.1	14.3	
Univ. of Michigan	19.6	75.0	5.4	26.2	68.9	4.9	52.2	40.7	7.1	
Wayne State Univ.	53.6	40.3	6.1	61.5	31.5	7.0	73.9	16.4	9.7	
Western Michigan Univ.	41.5	54.1	4.4	54.1	41.5	4.4	71.0	14.5	14.5	
Univ. of Detroit	60.2	34.1	5.7	73.8	17.0	9.2	79.6	10.2	10.2	
Detroit & Suburban Areas	63.4	26.8	9.8	70.4	16.9	12.7	67.6	7.0	25.4	
Southern Michigan Area	40.0	50.9	9.1	52.7	34.5	12.8	63.6	18.2	18.2	
Central Michigan Area	83.3	16.7	0	83.3	16.7		66.7	0	33.3	
School Unknown	50.0	35.0	15.0	65.0	30.0	5.0	55.0	20.0	25.0	
Total Respondents	35.6	58.9	5.5	44.0	50.0	6.0	64.4	25.5	10.1	

Table A-40

EXPECTATION THAT GRADUATE STUDENTS WILL USE LIBRARY RESOURCES OTHER THAN CAMPUS LIBRARY BY FIELD OF STUDY

	A			B			C			
	Course and Seminar Work			Term Papers and Special Assignments			Theses and Dissertations			
Field of Study	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Total Each Section
Humanities										
Fine Arts	44.9	50.6	4.5	43.8	43.8	12.4	50.5	32.7	16.8	100.0
English, Speech	40.3	56.2	3.5	52.8	44.4	2.8	70.8	16.0	13.2	
Foreign Languages	35.0	61.7	3.3	43.3	55.0	1.7	73.3	16.7	10.0	
Philosophy, Religion	41.2	55.9	2.9	52.9	44.2	2.9	73.6	23.5	2.9	
All Others	55.0	35.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	15.0	15.0	
Social Sciences										
Business, Economics	35.9	60.3	3.8	51.9	42.9	5.2	71.2	19.2	9.6	
Education	47.2	48.0	4.8	55.3	39.8	4.9	63.5	21.5	15.0	
Geography	50.0	46.9	3.1	71.9	28.1	0	93.8	6.2	0	
History, Law, Polit. Science	38.7	52.4	8.9	47.0	44.7	8.3	75.0	14.3	10.7	
Psychology	30.6	65.3	4.1	41.3	53.7	5.0	57.0	33.1	9.9	
Anthropology, Sociology	47.8	47.2	5.0	57.2	37.8	5.0	68.6	18.6	12.8	
All Others	47.2	46.1	6.7	55.0	40.5	4.5	67.4	19.1	13.5	
Biological Sciences										
Agriculture, Forestry	17.4	80.4	2.2	23.9	73.9	2.2	67.4	32.6	0	
Biochemistry	28.0	70.0	2.0	30.0	68.0	2.0	58.0	38.0	4.0	
Biology, Botany, Zoology	43.5	52.2	4.3	47.8	47.8	4.4	71.7	21.8	6.5	
Health Fields, Physiology	26.4	67.0	6.6	36.5	55.9	7.6	52.3	38.6	9.1	
Home Economics	30.8	69.2	0	42.3	57.7	0	61.5	34.7	3.8	
All Others	28.6	65.8	5.6	37.6	56.8	5.6	64.6	28.1	7.3	
Physical Sciences										
Chemistry	28.4	67.1	4.5	36.3	55.7	8.0	61.4	30.6	8.0	
Earth Sciences	31.8	68.2	0	36.4	63.6	0	72.7	27.3	0	
Engineering	34.4	61.7	3.9	44.8	51.3	3.9	68.8	28.6	2.6	
Mathematics	19.1	73.9	7.0	17.4	73.0	9.6	44.4	43.4	12.2	
Physics	20.8	77.1	2.1	22.9	72.9	4.2	70.8	25.0	4.2	
All Others	30.6	65.3	4.1	34.7	59.2	6.1	59.2	36.7	4.1	
Total Respondents	35.6	58.9	5.5	44.0	50.0	6.0	64.4	25.5	10.1	

Table A-41

USE OF READING LISTS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' COURSE AND SEMINAR WORK TAILORED TO LIBRARY MATERIALS AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS BY SCHOOL

School	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	73.6	14.7	7.8	3.9	100.0	8.0	57.3	25.4	9.3	0	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	50.6	38.2	11.2	0		6.7	44.4	31.2	13.3	4.4	
Michigan State Univ.	58.4	30.0	8.0	3.6		8.3	57.1	28.0	5.7	0.9	
Michigan Tech Univ.	72.9	13.6	12.1	1.4		6.3	45.8	37.5	10.4	0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	82.4	11.7	0	5.9		0	57.2	35.7	7.1	0	
Oakland Univ.	50.0	35.7	14.3	0		0	42.9	42.9	14.2	0	
Univ. of Michigan	50.1	35.5	11.4	3.0		40.6	47.9	8.5	1.5	1.5	
Wayne State Univ.	47.6	37.6	11.2	3.6		23.6	51.6	19.7	4.5	0.6	
Western Michigan Univ.	75.5	17.6	5.0	1.9		4.2	48.3	29.2	16.7	1.6	
Univ. of Detroit	42.1	38.6	15.9	3.4		16.2	62.2	16.2	2.7	2.7	
Detroit & Suburban Area	53.5	31.0	11.3	4.2		26.3	60.5	7.9	5.3	0	
Southern Michigan Area	67.3	23.6	7.3	1.8		8.1	67.6	18.9	2.7	2.7	
Central Michigan Area	66.7	16.7	16.7	0		25.0	25.0	50.0	0	0	
School Unknown	65.0	30.0	5.0	0		23.1	38.4	15.4	0	23.1	
Total Respondents	55.8	31.3	9.9	3.0		19.9	52.3	20.6	5.8	1.4	

Table A-42

USE OF READING LISTS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS' COURSE AND SEMINAR WORK TAILORED TO LIBRARY MATERIALS AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS BY FIELD OF STUDY

	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
Field of Study	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Signifi-cantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Humanities											
Fine Arts	56.2	24.7	13.5	5.6	100.0	18.0	58.0	14.0	8.0	2.0	100.0
English, Speech	68.7	26.4	2.8	2.1		12.1	51.6	28.3	4.0	4.0	
Foreign Languages	75.0	23.4	1.6	0		6.7	66.7	15.5	8.9	2.2	
Philosophy, Religion	53.0	41.2	5.8	0		16.7	50.0	22.2	11.1	0	
All Others	55.0	40.0	0	5.0		0	54.5	18.2	18.2	9.1	
Social Sciences											
Business, Economics	63.5	29.5	5.1	1.9		16.2	53.6	19.2	10.0	1.0	
Education	56.9	35.0	5.7	2.4		16.4	58.6	20.7	2.9	1.4	
Geography	65.6	34.4	0	0		0	42.9	42.9	14.2	0	
History, Law, Polit. Science	66.7	22.6	4.8	5.9		12.5	51.7	24.1	11.7	0	
Psychology	47.9	40.5	7.4	4.2		13.8	37.9	34.5	12.1	1.7	
Anthropology, Sociology	57.2	37.8	1.4	3.6		6.3	52.5	35.0	5.0	1.2	
All Others	47.2	46.1	2.2	4.5		26.2	47.6	23.8	2.4	0	
Biological Sciences											
Agriculture, Forestry	60.9	26.1	10.9	2.1		14.3	78.5	7.2	0	0	
Biochemistry	48.0	40.0	8.0	4.0		29.2	37.5	25.0	8.3	0	
Biology, Botany, Zoology	56.6	32.6	6.5	4.3		15.4	46.2	26.9	11.5	0	
Health Fields, Physiology	46.2	34.1	16.2	3.5		46.1	45.1	5.5	0	3.3	
Home Economics	65.4	30.8	3.8	0		23.6	58.8	17.6	0	0	
All Others	50.0	30.3	15.2	4.5		32.6	45.0	16.8	5.6	0	
Physical Sciences											
Chemistry	63.6	21.6	13.6	1.2		26.8	51.8	19.7	0	1.7	
Earth Sciences	68.2	27.3	4.5	0		20.0	66.7	13.3	0	0	
Engineering	41.6	33.1	24.0	1.3		18.7	54.7	20.3	6.3	0	
Mathematics	49.6	27.8	20.9	1.7		36.9	47.2	12.3	1.8	1.8	
Physics	39.6	27.1	33.3	0		15.8	63.3	10.5	5.2	5.2	
All Others	61.3	28.6	8.1	2.0		36.7	43.3	13.3	6.7	0	
Total Respondents	55.8	31.3	9.9	3.0	100.0	19.9	52.3	20.6	5.8	1.4	

Table A-43

USE OF READING LISTS FOR THESES AND DISSERTATIONS TAILORED TO LIBRARY MATERIALS ON CAMPUS BY SCHOOL

	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
School	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	46.2	32.3	12.7	8.8	100.0	4.3	46.8	36.2	10.6	2.1	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	35.9	43.9	14.6	5.6		12.5	37.5	37.5	12.5	0	
Michigan State Univ.	22.8	56.2	14.8	6.2		7.6	58.8	24.4	6.9	2.3	
Michigan Tech Univ.	45.5	34.8	13.6	6.1		6.7	36.7	43.3	13.3	0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	53.0	23.5	17.6	5.9		0	66.7	33.3	0	0	
Oakland Univ.	28.6	50.0	21.4	0		0	25.0	75.0	0	0	
Univ. of Michigan	19.8	57.4	16.5	6.3		41.8	44.4	8.5	0.7	4.6	
Wayne State Univ.	17.0	57.9	18.8	6.3		26.8	44.7	21.4	1.8	5.3	
Western Michigan Univ.	33.3	49.7	10.1	6.9		3.8	34.0	37.7	24.5	0	
Univ. of Detroit	23.9	53.4	18.2	4.5		14.3	57.1	19.0	4.8	4.8	
Detroit & Suburban Area	24.0	50.6	11.3	14.1		17.7	47.0	11.8	5.9	17.6	
Southern Michigan Area	38.2	43.6	14.6	3.6		9.5	52.5	23.7	4.8	9.5	
Central Michigan Area	16.7	50.0	33.3	0		100.0	0	0	0	0	
School Unknown	30.0	45.0	5.0	20.0		33.3	66.7	0	0	0	
Total Respondents	24.6	53.3	15.5	6.6		19.0	47.4	23.4	6.9	3.3	

Table A-44

USE OF READING LISTS FOR THESES AND DISSERTATIONS TAILORED TO LIBRARY MATERIALS ON CAMPUS BY FIELD OF STUDY

	Do You Tailor Reading Lists?					If Yes, How Restrictive Is This?					
Field of Study	Yes	No	Don't Use	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Humanities											
Fine Arts	24.7	46.1	18.0	11.2	100.0	18.2	50.0	22.7	9.1	0	100.0
English, Speech	37.5	45.9	10.4	6.2		9.3	42.5	35.2	7.4	5.6	
Foreign Languages	48.3	43.3	6.7	1.7		6.9	62.0	20.7	6.9	3.5	
Philosophy, Religion	35.3	58.8	5.9	0		25.0	58.3	16.7	0	0	
All Others	25.0	60.0	5.0	10.0		0	60.0	20.0	20.0	0	
Social Sciences											
Business, Economics	24.3	55.8	14.1	5.8		7.9	57.9	18.4	13.2	2.6	
Education	27.6	54.1	10.6	7.7		14.7	57.4	22.1	2.9	2.9	
Geography	31.3	59.4	9.3	0		10.0	0	40.0	40.0	10.0	
History, Law, Polit. Science	39.9	45.8	5.9	8.4		7.5	38.8	35.8	14.9	3.0	
Psychology	20.6	60.3	14.1	5.0		24.0	40.0	24.0	8.0	4.0	
Anthropology, Sociology	22.9	55.7	12.1	9.3		6.2	43.8	46.9	3.1	0	
All Others	19.0	63.0	9.0	9.0		11.8	58.7	17.7	0	11.8	
Biological Sciences											
Agriculture, Forestry	10.9	63.0	21.7	4.4		0	60.0	40.0	0	0	
Biochemistry	12.0	62.0	22.0	4.0		50.0	33.3	0	0	16.7	
Biology, Botany, Zoology	21.8	65.2	8.7	4.3		20.0	60.0	20.0	0	0	
Health Fields, Physiology	20.3	50.8	20.8	8.1		50.0	40.0	2.5	2.5	5.0	
Home Economics	15.4	57.7	23.1	3.8		25.0	50.0	25.0	0	0	
All Others	19.2	60.6	14.6	5.6		32.4	47.1	17.7	2.8	0	
Physical Sciences											
Chemistry	19.3	51.1	24.0	5.6		35.3	53.0	11.7	0	0	
Earth Sciences	18.2	68.2	9.1	4.5		50.0	50.0	0	0	0	
Engineering	14.9	51.9	29.3	3.9		26.1	39.2	21.7	4.3	8.7	
Mathematics	20.0	40.9	28.7	10.4		39.1	34.8	13.1	8.7	4.3	
Physics	16.7	50.0	33.3	0		25.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	0	
All Others	26.5	57.2	14.3	2.0		38.5	38.5	15.4	7.6	0	
Total Respondents	24.6	53.3	15.5	6.6		19.0	47.4	23.4	6.9	3.3	

Table A-45

LIBRARIES USED BY GRADUATE STUDENTS RANKED BY FREQUENCY OF USE

Library	Most Frequently Used	Second Most Frequently Used	Third Most Frequently Used
University of Michigan	1	1	2
Detroit Public Library	2	2	3
All Out-of-State Libraries	3	2	1
Wayne State University	4	4	5
Michigan State Library	5	6	6
Michigan State University	6	5	4
All Business Libraries	7	7	7
Kalamazoo College	8	7	8
Kalamazoo Public	9	9	9

APPENDIX B

The tables in Chapter II and Appendix B (with the exception of Table B-8) are based on the responses to a questionnaire distributed to all teachers of off-campus courses at the nine public universities which currently sponsor these programs. The questionnaire (see Appendix E for a copy of the questionnaire) was first reviewed at a meeting of the Michigan Coordinating Council of Field Service Directors for their advice on the clarity of wording and particular points to be questioned. Each director was sent for distribution the number of questionnaires he needed for his off-campus faculty and the completed questionnaire was mailed direct by the faculty member to the Michigan State Library.

A total of 1, 220 questionnaires was distributed to off-campus faculty and 406 usable replies were received, a return of exactly one-third (33. 3%). Table B-1 lists the number distributed, the number completed, and the percent of returns by school. The range is from 10% to 80%. It will be noted, however, that the 10% return from Michigan Technological University represents only one response and any attempt to indicate distribution in the subsequent tables for this school would be statistically unreliable. For this reason this university is not listed individually in the remaining tables, but it is included in all totals. The one response from an unknown school is also included in totals only.

Table B-8, the listing of off-campus teaching locations by university, is based on information received direct from the Field Service Director at each university in response to a letter requesting such a list. It will be noted that of the total of 166 locations 119 have centers from one university, 33 have centers from two universities, 11 from three and three from four universities.

Table B-1

OFF-CAMPUS QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

School	Number Distributed	Number Completed	Percent
Central Michigan University	75	35	46.7
Eastern Michigan University	150	32	21.3
Ferris State College	5	4	80.0
Michigan State University	350	112	32.0
Michigan Technological University	10	1	10.0
Northern Michigan University	65	23	35.4
University of Michigan	240	97	40.4
Wayne State University	150	60	40.0
Western Michigan University	175	41	23.4
School Unknown		1	
Total	1,220	406	33.3

Table B-2

DIFFERENCES IN ASSIGNMENTS BY FACULTY TO OFF-CAMPUS AND ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS BY SCHOOL

School	Yes	No	Total *
Central Michigan University	80.6	19.4	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	54.5	45.5	
Ferris State College	33.3	66.7	
Michigan State University	70.7	29.3	
Northern Michigan University	68.8	31.2	
University of Michigan	60.0	40.0	
Wayne State University	29.5	60.5	
Western Michigan University	69.4	30.6	
Total	62.2	37.8	

---

* Percentages are based on the total who replied. Those who did not answer because they do not teach the same courses off campus and on campus for the same institution are not included.

Table B-3

OFF CAMPUS: TAILORING OF READING ASSIGNMENTS TO MATERIALS AVAILABLE LOCALLY BY SCHOOL

	Do You Tailor Reading Assignments?				If Yes, To What Extent Is This Restrictive?					
School	Yes	No	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	51.4	40.0	8.6	100.0	16.7	22.2	55.5	0	5.6	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	53.1	43.8	3.1		17.6	47.1	29.4	5.9	0	
Ferris State College	75.0	25.0	0		33.3	66.7	0	0	0	
Michigan State Univ.	52.7	45.5	1.8		6.8	40.7	35.6	16.9	0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	65.3	21.7	13.0		0	53.4	33.3	13.3	0	
Univ. of Michigan	51.5	46.4	2.1		14.0	50.0	26.0	8.0	2.0	
Wayne State Univ.	51.7	46.7	1.6		25.8	45.2	25.8	0	3.2	
Western Michigan Univ.	61.0	34.1	4.9		0	52.0	32.0	16.0	0	
Total Respondents	54.3	42.3	3.4		11.8	44.6	32.7	9.5	1.4	

Table B-4

OFF CAMPUS: TAILORING OF READING ASSIGNMENTS TO MATERIALS AVAILABLE LOCALLY BY FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION

Field of Specialization	Do You Tailor Reading Assignments?				If Yes, To What Extent Is This Restrictive?					
	Yes	No	No Answer	Total	Not At All	Somewhat	Significantly	Severely	No Answer	Total
Humanities	53.4	43.3	3.3	100.0	12.5	53.1	25.0	9.4	0	100.0
Social Sciences	52.4	43.9	3.7		7.0	41.9	30.2	18.6	2.3	
Biological Sciences	50.0	50.0	0		40.0	20.0	40.0	0	0	
Physical Sciences	31.6	57.9	10.5		50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0	
Professional	56.4	40.0	3.6		11.0	44.1	37.0	7.9	0	
All Combinations	55.6	44.4	0		0	80.0	0	0	20.0	
Total	54.3	42.3	3.4		11.8	44.6	32.7	9.5	1.4	

Table B-5

ADDITIONAL LIBRARY RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR SPECIFIC COURSES OFF CAMPUS BY SCHOOL

School	Are Additional Resources Available?				If Yes, Supplied by What Agency?							
	Yes	No	No Answer	Total	Campus Library	Extension or Field Services	Local Public Library	The State Library	Other	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan Univ.	20.0	77.1	2.9	100.0	71.4	28.6	0	0	0	0	0	100.0
Eastern Michigan Univ.	53.1	40.6	6.3		52.9	11.8	0	0	0	5.9	29.4	
Ferris State College	75.0	25.0	0		0	33.3	0	0	33.3	0	33.3	
Michigan State Univ.	66.1	28.5	5.4		40.4	28.4	1.4	0	1.4	5.4	23.0	
Northern Michigan Univ.	43.5	56.5	0		60.0	10.0	0	0	0	0	30.0	
Univ. of Michigan	86.6	11.3	2.1		32.1	58.3	0	0	0	2.4	7.2	
Wayne State Univ.	70.0	28.3	1.7		73.8	9.5	2.4	0	2.4	2.4	9.5	
Western Michigan Univ.	75.6	24.4	0		25.8	16.1	0	0	0	0	58.1	
Total Respondents	66.3	30.8	2.9		43.5	31.6	0.8	0	1.1	3.0	20.0	

Table B-6

PROPORTION OF FACULTY WHO PERSONALLY CARRY LIBRARY MATERIALS TO CLASS FOR LOAN TO STUDENTS BY SCHOOL

School	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	57.1	42.9	0	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	71.9	21.9	6.2	
Ferris State College	75.0	25.0	0	
Michigan State University	70.5	29.5	0	
Northern Michigan University	78.3	21.7	0	
University of Michigan	43.3	55.7	1.0	
Wayne State University	65.0	35.0	0	
Western Michigan University	78.0	22.0	0	
Total	63.3	36.0	0.7	

Table B-7

FUTURE RELIANCE ON LIBRARY RESOURCES FOR OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS BY SCHOOL

School	More	The Same	Less	No Answer	Total
Central Michigan University	34.3	57.1	0	8.6	100.0
Eastern Michigan University	34.4	53.0	6.3	6.3	
Ferris State College	25.0	50.0	0	25.0	
Michigan State University	36.6	52.6	6.3	4.5	
Northern Michigan University	39.1	47.8	4.4	8.7	
University of Michigan	33.0	63.9	2.1	1.0	
Wayne State University	30.0	68.3	1.7	0	
Western Michigan University	31.7	65.9	0	2.4	
Total	34.0	59.1	3.2	3.7	

Table B-8

OFF-CAMPUS TEACHING LOCATIONS BY UNIVERSITY

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ
1. Adrian				X					
2. Albion				X					X
3. Alger				X					
4. Allegan									X
5. Allen Park								X	
6. Alma				X					
7. Almont				X					
8. Alpena	X			X					
9. Armada								X	
10. Auburn Heights								X	
11. Bad Axe	X								
12. Bark River						X			
13. Battle Creek				X					X
14. Bay City	X			X					
15. Bellevue									X
16. Benton Harbor				X			X		X

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
17. Benzonia	X								
18. Big Rapids				X			X		
19. Birmingham				X			X	X	
20. Bloomfield Hills							X	X	
21. Bridgman									X
22. Brighton		X							
23. Cadillac	X			X					
24. Camp Blodgett				X					
25. Camp Oakland				X					
26. Capoc								X	
27. Caro				X					
28. Center Line		X							
29. Centreville									X
30. Cheyboygan	X			X					
31. Cherry Hill		X							
32. Coldwater				X					X
33. Constantine				X					
34. Davidson				X					
35. Dearborn				X			X	X	

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
36. Dearborn Heights								X	
37. Detroit				X			X	X	
38. Dowagioc									X
39. East Detroit								X	
40. East Lansing				X					
41. Ecorse				X					
42. Edmore				X					
43. Elkton-Pigeon-Bay Port	X								
44. Engadine						X			
45. Escanaba				X		X			
46. Farmington							X	X	
47. Ferndale							X		
48. Flint		X		X			X	X	
49. Flat Rock								X	
50. Fraser								X	
51. Freemont			X						
52. Garden City							X	X	
53. Gaylord	X			X					

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
54. Gladwin	X								
55. Glen Lake	X								
56. Grand Blanc				X					
57. Grand Haven				X					
58. Grand Ledge				X					
59. Grand Rapids			X	X			X		X
60. Greenville	X								
61. Grosse Pointe							X	X	
62. Gull Lake							X		
63. Gwinn						X			
64. Hamtramck								X	
65. Hart									X
66. Hartford									X
67. Hastings									X
68. Hemlock	X								
69. Hillsdale				X					
70. Higgins Lake				X					
71. Highland Park								X	
72. Holland				X					

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
73. Houghton					X	X			
74. Indian River	X								
75. Inkster								X	
76. Ionia									X
77. Iron Mountain				X		X			
78. Iron River				X		X			
79. Ironwood				X					
80. Ithaca	X								
81. Jackson		X		X					X
82. Kincheloe AFB						X			
83. Kingsley	X								
84. Lake Odessa				X					
85. Lansing				X					X
86. Lapeer		X							
87. Laurence									X
88. Leland				X					
89. Lewiston	X								
90. Lincoln Park				X					
91. Livonia				X				X	

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
92. Ludington				X					
93. Madison Heights								X	
94. Mandeville				X					
95. Manistee				X					
96. Manistique						X			
97. Marlette	X	X		X					
98. Marquette				X		X			
99. Marshall									X
100. Melvindale								X	
101. Menominee				X		X			
102. Middleton				X					
103. Midland	X			X			X		
104. Monroe		X							
105. Mount Clemens		X		X			X	X	
106. Mount Pleasant	X								
107. Munising						X			
108. Muskegon				X			X		X
109. Nankin Mills								X	
110. Negaunee						X			

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
111. New Baltimore								X	
112. Newberry						X			
113. New Boston		X							
114. Niles				X					
115. Oakland County				X					
116. Oakland Univ.				X					
117. Oak Park				X			X		
118. Olivet				X					
119. Oscoda	X			X					
120. Owosso				X					
121. Oxford								X	
122. Paw Paw									X
123. Petersburg								X	
124. Petoskey	X			X					
125. Pinconning	X								
126. Plymouth		X							
127. Pontiac		X							
128. Portage									X
129. Port Huron				X			X	X	

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
130. Powers						X			
131. Redford								X	
132. Riverview								X	
133. Rockford									X
134. Romeo				X					
135. Romulus								X	
136. Roscommon				X					
137. Roseville								X	
138. Royal Oaks							X		
139. Saginaw	X			X			X		
140. St. Claire Shores				X				X	
141. St. Johns	X			X					
142. St. Joseph				X					X
143. Saulte Ste. Marie				X		X			
144. Sawyer AFB						X			
145. Scottville	X								
146. Southfield							X	X	
147. Southgate		X							
148. South Haven									X

Location	Central Michigan Univ.	Eastern Michigan Univ.	Ferris State College	Michigan State Univ.	Michigan Tech Univ.	Northern Michigan Univ.	Univ. of Michigan	Wayne State Univ.	Western Michigan Univ.
149. Spring Arbor				X					
150. Stanton	X								
151. Stephenson						X			
152. Stevensville									X
153. Sturgis									X
154. Three Rivers									X
155. Traverse City	X		X	X					
156. Trenton		X							
157. Utica				X				X	
158. Van Dyke				X					
159. Warren				X				X	
160. Warren Woods				X				X	
161. Waterford Township				X					
162. Wayne		X							
163. West Branch	X								
164. Wyandotte								X	
165. Wyoming				X					X
166. Ypsilanti				X					

APPENDIX C

The tables in Chapter III and in Appendix C are based on the responses to a questionnaire sent to elementary and secondary teachers in Michigan. Unlike the on-campus and off-campus faculty members where the total population was sent questionnaires, the questionnaire to teachers was sent to a sample of 2, 500 chosen from a master list of all public school teachers in Michigan prepared by the State Education Department. This master list includes the names of all the more than 80, 000 elementary and secondary teachers alphabetically arranged. Two thousand five hundred names were chosen from this list by means of a table of random numbers and the questionnaires were addressed to the individual teachers selected. The addressed questionnaires were then grouped by Michigan intermediate school district and sent to the superintendent of that district who distributed them to the teachers selected. The teacher was provided with an envelope to send the completed questionnaire direct to the Michigan State Library. Of the total number of questionnaires distributed to teachers, usable replies were received from 826 or 33. 0%.

The responses received were divided as follows: elementary teachers 46. 7% and secondary teachers 47. 9%. An additional 5. 4% gave no answer or indicated they taught at both levels. These figures can be compared to the division between elementary and secondary teachers for Michigan as reported by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1965 edition. In this publication the Michigan figures for 1964 were elementary teachers 55. 0% and secondary teachers 45. 0%, with no separate provision made for those who teach at both levels. This comparison shows that the survey is skewed slightly toward the secondary school teacher, but we do not believe the skewing is serious enough to alter the general findings of this survey concerning research and reference needs.

In some of the tables contained in both Appendix C and Appendix D and the chapters they supplement (III and IV), classification is by geographic district. The counties included in each district are the following:

District I—Upper Peninsula includes Alger, Baroga, Chippewa, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenau, Luce, Mackinac, Marquette, Menominee, Ontonagon, and Schoolcraft Counties.

District II—Northern Michigan includes Alcona, Alpena, Antrim, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Crawford, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Iosco, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Manistee, Missaukee, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, and Wexford Counties.

District III—Central Michigan includes Arenac, Bay, Clare, Gladwin, Gratiot, Isabella, Lake, Mason, Mecosta, Midland, Montcalm, Newaygo, Oceana, and Osceola Counties.

District IV—Grand Rapids-Muskegon Area includes Kent. Muskegon, and Ottawa Counties.

District V—Flint-Saginaw Area includes Genesee, Huron, Lapeer, Saginaw, St. Clair, Sanilac, and Tuscola Counties.

District VI—Lansing Area includes Clinton, Eaton, Ingham, Ionia, Livingston, and Shiawassee Counties.

District VII—Suburban Detroit Area includes Macomb and Oakland Counties.

District VIII—Southwest Michigan includes Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph and Van Buren Counties.

District IX—Southeast Michigan includes Hillsdale, Jackson, Lenawee, Monroe, and Washtenaw Counties.

District X—Wayne County includes only that county with its main city Detroit.

The geographic distribution of elementary and secondary school teachers by these districts in Michigan as reported by the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, for 1960, was compared with the district distribution received in this survey. The results are reported in the following table.

District	1960 Census	This Survey
I	4.1%	7.0%
II	3.3	2.9
III	5.7	5.6
IV	8.6	5.7
V	10.6	7.9
VI	6.2	6.2
VII	14.8	19.2
VIII	9.7	11.6
IX	7.5	7.7
X	29.5	25.5
No Answer	0	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0

While there are some differences between the present survey and the 1960 census, the differences are not great and may be the result of population shifts such as that from rural to urban areas which have taken place since the census was made in 1960. The rank orders of the districts in the two sets of figures are similar throughout the list. Of particular note is the fact that of the total the first four districts (northern and central Michigan) account for 21.7% of the teachers in the census and 21.2% in the survey. The census reports 51.8% of the teachers are located in Detroit, its suburbs, and the southeastern area (Districts VII, IX and X) and for this survey the respondents from these districts equaled 52.4% of the total; there has undoubtedly been some rise in the proportion of teachers in the suburban areas since the time of the census. On the basis of these larger geographic areas (mainly rural and urban) the survey response and the census reports coincide to an even higher degree than they do on the district level which would indicate that the survey sample, as measured by this factor, corresponds closely to the total teacher population.

A copy of the questionnaire sent to the elementary and secondary teachers is included as Exhibit III in Appendix E.

Table C-1

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY LEVEL OF TEACHING

Level	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	Other	Answer	Total
Elementary	0	27.8	67.0	4.1	1.1	100.0
Secondary	0	52.5	46.1	1.4	0	
Both	0	63.6	31.8	0	4.6	
No Answer	0	31.3	62.5	0	6.3	
Total Respondents	0	40.9	55.9	2.4	0.8	

Table C-2

PERCENT OF TEACHERS ENGAGED IN GRADUATE WORK FOR AN ADVANCED DEGREE BY LEVEL OF TEACHING

Level	Doctorate	Master's	Other	None	No Answer	Total
Elementary	2.7	27.0	6.3	61.3	2.7	100.0
Secondary	3.0	30.7	8.7	53.8	3.8	
Both	4.6	27.3	0	68.1	0	
No Answer	0	31.3	6.2	56.3	6.2	
Total	2.9	28.9	7.2	57.8	3.2	

Table C-3

PERCENT OF TEACHERS
ENGAGED IN GRADUATE WORK FOR
AN ADVANCED DEGREE BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT

District	Doctorate	Master's	Other	None	No Answer	Total
I. Upper Peninsula	0	20.7	6.9	69.0	3.4	100.0
II. Northern Michigan	0	33.3	8.3	54.2	4.2	
III. Central Michigan	6.5	41.3	10.9	39.1	2.2	
IV. Grand Rapids - Muskegon Area	0	34.0	8.5	53.2	4.3	
V. Flint - Saginaw Area	1.5	29.2	4.6	58.5	6.2	
VI. Lansing Area	0	39.2	7.9	52.9	0	
VII. Suburban Detroit Area (counties other than Wayne)	5.7	29.6	5.0	57.2	2.5	
VIII. Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	1.0	26.0	6.3	62.5	4.2	
IX. Southeast Michigan (Jackson-Ann Arbor)	0	12.5	6.3	68.7	12.5	
X. Wayne County	3.8	26.1	9.0	58.7	2.4	
Total	2.9	28.9	7.2	57.8	3.2	

Table C-4

INSTITUTIONS AT WHICH TEACHERS ARE CURRENTLY WORKING FOR A GRADUATE DEGREE

Institution	Number of Teachers Reporting Graduate Study at Institution
1. Alma College	1
2. Andrews University	1
3. Central Michigan University	23
4. Cranbrook Academy	1
5. Eastern Michigan University	33
6. Marygrove College	1
7. Michigan State University	70
8. Michigan Tech University	2
9. Northern Michigan University	13
10. Oakland University	1
11. Olivet College	1
12. University of Detroit	4
13. University of Michigan - Ann Arbor	47
14. University of Michigan - Dearborn	1
15. University of Michigan - Flint	2
16. Wayne State University	54
17. Western Michigan University	33
Total	288

Table C-5

PERCENT OF TEACHERS ENGAGED IN RESEARCH OTHER THAN FOR A DEGREE BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT

District	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
I. Upper Peninsula	8.6	91.4	0	100.0
II. Northern Michigan	4.2	95.8	0	
III. Central Michigan	4.4	95.6	0	
IV. Grand Rapids - Muskegon Area	4.3	93.6	2.1	
V. Flint-Saginaw Area	10.8	87.7	1.5	
VI. Lansing Area	9.8	90.2	0	
VII. Suburban Detroit Area (counties other than Wayne)	18.2	80.5	1.3	
VIII. Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	9.4	89.6	1.0	
IX. Southeast Michigan (Jackson-Ann Arbor)	0	93.8	6.2	
X. Wayne County	11.9	86.2	1.9	
Total	11.0	87.7	1.3	

Table C-6

LENGTH OF SERVICE BY LEVEL OF TEACHING

Level	2 Years or Less	Over 2 to 5 Years	Over 5 to 10 Years	Over 10 Years	No Answer	Total
Elementary	7.1	21.3	23.2	48.2	0.2	100.0
Secondary	9.5	22.8	28.5	38.6	0.6	
Both	0	18.2	27.3	54.5	0	
No Answer	6.3	0	25.0	62.5	6.3	
Total Respondents	8.1	21.3	25.7	44.2	0.7	

Table C-7

LIBRARIES USED BY TEACHERS

Library (Used by at Least Ten Respondents)	Number of Respondents Indicating Use*	Percent of Total Respondents (826)
Public		
Ann Arbor	10	1.2
Detroit	90	10.9
Grand Rapids	18	2.2
Grosse Pointe	18	2.2
Kalamazoo	22	2.7
Macomb County	13	1.6
Peter White	10	1.2
Royal Oak	11	1.3
Bookmobile	20	2.4
All Others (197)	476	57.6
Total	688	
Michigan State Library - Total	44	5.3
Schools - Total	429	51.9
Community Colleges - Total	12	1.5
Michigan Colleges and Universities		
Central Michigan University	13	1.6
Eastern Michigan University	29	3.5
Michigan State University	31	3.8
Northern Michigan University	10	1.2
Oakland University	11	1.3
University of Michigan	39	4.7
Wayne State University	78	9.4
Western Michigan University	27	3.3
All Others (13)	24	2.9
Total	262	
Out-of-State Libraries - Total	4	0.5
Personal - Total	5	0.6
Total Responses	1,444*	

---

* Because respondents could list more than one library, total is more than the number of respondents.

Table C-8

ADEQUACY OF ALL TYPES OF LIBRARY USED FOR PROFESSIONAL NEEDS OF TEACHERS (PERCENT)

Type of Library	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Public	28.9	37.7	21.7	5.8	0.4	5.5	100.0
Michigan State Library	31.8	34.1	22.7	6.8	2.3	2.3	
Schools	22.6	40.4	25.9	6.4	0.5	4.2	
Community Colleges	16.7	25.0	25.0	0	0	33.3	
Michigan Colleges and Universities	38.9	35.1	19.1	3.1	0	3.8	
Out-of-State	50.0	25.0	25.0	0	0	0	
Personal	20.0	60.0	0	0	0	20.0	
Total	29.8	39.1	23.2	5.7	0.4	1.8	

Table C-9

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS: ADEQUACY OF INDIVIDUAL LIBRARIES USED

	Number of Respondents Reporting						
Library	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Public							
Ann Arbor	5	3	0	2	0	0	10
Detroit	42	34	9	2	0	3	90
Grand Rapids	2	11	4	0	0	1	18
Gross Pointe	5	9	2	0	0	2	18
Kalamazoo	9	6	4	1	0	2	22
Macomb County	1	5	4	1	0	2	13
Peter White	1	7	2	0	0	0	10
Royal Oak	5	4	2	0	0	0	11
Bookmobile	4	6	2	6	0	2	20
All Others	125	174	120	28	3	26	476
Total	199	259	149	40	3	38	688
Michigan State Library - Total	14	15	10	3	1	1	44
Schools - Total	97	173	111	28	2	18	429
Community Colleges - Total	2	3	3	0	0	4	12
Michigan Colleges and Universities							
Central Michigan University	6	2	5	0	0	0	13
Eastern Michigan University	9	11	8	1	0	0	29
Michigan State University	16	7	5	0	0	3	31
Northern Michigan University	2	5	2	0	0	1	10
Oakland University	3	5	3	0	0	0	11
University of Michigan	12	15	8	3	0	1	39
Wayne State University	38	28	8	1	0	3	78
Western Michigan University	10	10	3	2	0	2	27
All Others	6	9	8	1	0	0	24
Total	102	92	50	8	0	10	262
Out-of-State - Total	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Personal - Total	1	3	0	0	0	1	5
Total Responses	417	546	324	79	6	72	1,444

Table C-10

FREQUENCY OF USE OF LIBRARIES BY TEACHERS

	Number of Respondents Reporting					
Library	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infre-quently	No Answer	Total
Public						
Ann Arbor	0	0	6	4	0	10
Detroit	3	7	34	45	1	90
Grand Rapids	0	1	6	11	0	18
Grosse Pointe	0	3	5	10	0	18
Kalamazoo	1	5	5	9	2	22
Macomb County	0	0	2	8	3	13
Peter White	1	0	4	3	2	10
Royal Oak	0	3	0	8	0	11
Bookmobile	1	1	11	6	1	20
All Others	25	66	151	198	36	476
Total	31	86	224	302	45	688
Michigan State Library - Total	1	1	8	28	6	44
Schools - Total	165	100	73	72	19	429
Community Colleges - Total	1	1	2	8	0	12
Michigan Colleges and Universities						
Central Michigan University	1	5	1	5	1	13
Eastern Michigan University	3	1	5	17	3	29
Michigan State University	0	3	7	19	2	31
Northern Michigan University	0	0	5	4	1	10
Oakland University	0	5	3	3	0	11
University of Michigan	1	7	11	16	4	39
Wayne State University	12	9	17	37	3	78
Western Michigan University	1	2	6	16	2	27
All Others	2	2	6	13	1	24
Total	20	34	61	130	17	262
Out-of-State - Total	0	0	1	2	1	4
Personal - Total	2	1	0	0	2	5
Total Responses	220	223	369	542	90	1,444

Table C-11

TEACHERS: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE* OF LIBRARY USERS FROM EACH DISTRICT

Library (used by at least 10 teachers)	I Upper Peninsula	II Northern Michigan	III Central Michigan	IV Grand Rapids Area	V Flint-Saginaw	VI Lansing Area	VII Suburban Detroit	VIII Southwest Michigan	IX Southeast Michigan	X Wayne County	No District Named	Total
Public												
Ann Arbor									6 (60.0)	4 (40.0)		10 (100.0)
Detroit							29 (32.2)			61 (67.8)		90
Grand Rapids				18 (100.0)								18
Grosse Pointe							7 (38.9)			11 (61.1)		18
Kalamazoo								21 (95.5)			1 (4.5)	22
Macomb County							13 (100.0)					13
Peter White	10 (100.0)											10
Royal Oak							10 (90.9)			1 (9.1)		11
Bookmobile	1 (5.0)	2 (10.0)	2 (10.0)	2 (10.0)	4 (20.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0)	5 (25.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0)		20
All Others	29 (6.1)	13 (2.7)	33 (6.9)	20 (4.2)	46 (9.7)	23 (4.8)	80 (16.8)	55 (11.6)	52 (10.9)	120 (25.2)	5 (1.1)	476
Michigan State Library	12 (27.3)	2 (4.5)	2 (4.5)	2 (4.5)	4 (9.1)	8 (18.2)	3 (6.8)	6 (13.6)	3 (6.8)	0 (0)	2 (4.5)	44
Schools - Total	35 (8.2)	13 (3.0)	24 (5.6)	30 (7.0)	31 (7.2)	19 (4.4)	89 (20.7)	57 (13.3)	28 (6.5)	101 (23.5)	2 (0.5)	429
Community Colleges - Total		2 (16.7)			3 (25.0)		2 (16.7)			3 (25.0)	2 (16.7)	12
Michigan Colleges and Universities												
Central Michigan University			10 (76.9)		1 (7.7)	2 (15.4)						13
Eastern Michigan University					1 (3.4)		3 (10.3)		7 (24.1)	18 (62.1)		29
Michigan State University			2 (6.5)	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	18 (58.1)	4 (12.9)	2 (6.5)	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	31
Northern Michigan University	8 (80.0)						1 (10.0)		1 (10.0)			10
Oakland University							11 (100.0)					11
University of Michigan	1 (2.6)				5 (12.8)	1 (2.6)	5 (12.8)		7 (17.9)	19 (48.7)	1 (2.6)	39
Wayne State University					1 (1.3)		24 (30.8)	1 (1.3)		52 (66.7)		78
Western Michigan University				3 (11.1)				23 (85.2)			1 (3.7)	27
All Others	2 (8.3)		1 (4.2)	6 (25.0)		1 (4.2)	2 (8.3)	2 (8.3)	7 (29.2)	3 (12.5)		24
Out-of-State - Total								1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)			4
Personal					1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)			1 (20.0)	2 (40.0)		5
Total Responses	98 (6.8)	32 (2.2)	74 (5.1)	82 (5.7)	98 (6.8)	75 (5.2)	283 (19.6)	173 (12.0)	118 (8.2)	396 (27.5)	15 (1.0)	1,444 (100.0)

*Percentages enclosed in parentheses.

Table C-12

TEACHERS: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE* IN EACH DISTRICT USING SELECTED LIBRARIES

Library (used by at least 10 teachers)	I Upper Peninsula	II Northern Michigan	III Central Michigan	IV Grand Rapids Area	V Flint-Saginaw	VI Lansing Area	VII Suburban Detroit	VIII Southwest Michigan	IX Southeast Michigan	X Wayne County	No District Named
Public											
Ann Arbor									6 (5.1)	4 (1.0)	
Detroit							29 (10.2)			61 (15.4)	
Grand Rapids				18 (22.0)							
Grosse Pointe							7 (2.5)			11 (2.8)	
Kalamazoo								21 (12.1)			1 (6.7)
Macomb County							13 (4.6)				
Peter White	10 (10.2)										
Royal Oak							10 (3.5)			1 (0.3)	
Bookmobile	1 (1.0)	2 (6.3)	2 (2.7)	2 (2.4)	4 (4.1)	2 (2.7)		5 (2.9)	2 (1.7)		
All Others	29 (29.6)	13 (40.6)	33 (44.6)	20 (24.4)	46 (46.9)	23 (30.7)	80 (28.3)	55 (31.8)	52 (44.1)	120 (30.3)	5 (33.3)
Michigan State Library	12 (12.2)	2 (6.3)	2 (2.7)	2 (2.4)	4 (4.1)	8 (10.7)	3 (1.1)	6 (3.5)	3 (2.5)		2 (13.3)
Schools - Total	35 (35.7)	13 (40.6)	24 (32.4)	30 (36.6)	31 (31.6)	19 (25.3)	89 (31.4)	57 (32.9)	28 (23.7)	101 (25.5)	2 (13.3)
Community Colleges - Total		2 (6.3)			3 (3.1)		2 (0.7)			3 (0.8)	
Michigan Colleges and Universities											
Central Michigan University			10 (13.5)		1 (1.0)	2 (2.7)					
Eastern Michigan University					1 (1.0)		3 (1.1)		7 (5.9)	18 (4.5)	
Michigan State University			2 (2.7)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.0)	18 (24.0)	4 (1.4)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.3)	1 (6.7)
Northern Michigan University	8 (8.2)						1 (0.4)		1 (0.9)		
Oakland University							11 (3.9)				
University of Michigan	1 (1.0)				5 (5.1)	1 (1.3)	5 (1.8)		7 (5.9)	19 (4.8)	1 (6.7)
Wayne State University					1 (1.0)		24 (8.5)	1 (0.6)		52 (13.1)	
Western Michigan University				3 (3.7)				23 (13.3)			1 (6.7)
All Others	2 (2.0)		1 (1.4)	6 (7.3)		1 (1.3)	2 (0.7)	2 (1.2)	7 (5.9)	3 (0.8)	
Out-of-State Libraries - Total								1 (0.6)	3 (2.5)		
Personal - Total					1 (1.0)	1 (1.3)			1 (0.9)	2 (0.5)	
Total Responses	98 (100.0)	32	74	82	98	75	283	173	118	396	15

*Percentages enclosed in parentheses.

APPENDIX D

A fourth questionnaire used to gather data for this study was sent to a sample of 1, 851 Michigan manufacturing executives selected by random numbers from a published list. The list used is the alphabetical section of The Directory of Michigan Manufacturers 1965 published by the Michigan Manufacturer and Financial Record. In this list Michigan cities and towns are arranged alphabetically and the names of manufacturing concerns are listed alphabetically in the appropriate community. The random numbers were used to select both the page and the manufacturer listed on the page. In order to obtain a cross-section of executives with different responsibilities, eight job titles were selected—president, vice president-manufacturing, sales manager, treasurer, director of research, chief accountant, chief engineer, and personnel director. The officers with these responsibilities were chosen in rotating order. Thus in the case of the first company selected by random number the questionnaire was sent to the president; for the second company the questionnaire was sent to the vice president-manufacturing, and so on through the 1, 851 numbers. Thus 231 or 232 were selected in each category. The questionnaires were individually addressed and a return envelope included. Three weeks after the first questionnaire was sent a follow-up letter and second questionnaire was mailed to each of the original executives. From the total of 1, 851 names to whom questionnaires were sent, usable replies were received from 476 or 25. 7%.

To measure the correspondence of the study's respondents to the general manufacturing population in Michigan a comparison was made of the response rate by size of business according to number of employees with the number of manufacturers in Michigan by number of employees, as reported by the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, in its U. S. Census of Manufacturers, 1958 edition, Volume III, Area Statistics. The Census Bureau categories are not identical to the categories in this study, but combining of certain groups makes a comparison possible. The Bureau of the Census lists 91. 4% of Michigan manufacturers with 1-99 employees, 4. 8% with 100-249, 2. 8% with 250-999, and 1. 0% over 1, 000. This compares with this study having in the same categories 72. 5%, 11. 6%, 9. 0%, and 6. 3%, with no answer from 0. 6%. The differences may be partly accounted for by the changes that have taken place in the years between the two sets of data. Nonetheless, it would appear that even though this study is heavily weighted with small manufacturers, it is not as heavily weighted as the actual population is itself. The study may have a slight bias favoring larger companies which might bear upon the responses to such questions as the existence of a company library. Any inferences about the absolute number of company libraries existing in the state would not be warranted, for example, on the basis of the survey data.

A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix E as Exhibit IV. The tables in this appendix and in the section of Chapter IV concerning manufacturing executives are based on the responses to this questionnaire. The geographic districts used in these tables are the same as those in Appendix C and the counties in each district can be found listed in the earlier appendix.

Table D-1

FIRST CHOICE ORDER OF RANK OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR BUSINESS EXECUTIVES BY SIZE OF COMPANY BASED ON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

	Number of Employees				
Sources of Information	Less Than 25	25-99	100-249	250-999	1,000 & Over
Business Magazines	1	3	3	7	6
Newspapers	1	1	4	1	3
Informal Conversations with Associates	3	2	5	3	10
Professional Journals	5	4	1	2	1
Subscription Services (Kiplinger Letter, NICB Reports, etc.)	7	6	1	6	4
Technical Reports	4	4	5	7	6
Seminars, Conferences	9	7	5	4	4
Company Memoranda	6	8	9	4	2
Conventions	10	8	11	9	10
Books	11	11	5	10	6
Other	7	8	10	10	6

Table D-2

PERCENT OF COMPANIES HAVING LIBRARIES BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Number of Employees	Have Company Library	Do Not Have Company Library	No Answer	Total
Less than 25	21.1	76.0	2.9	100.0
25 - 99	21.3	78.0	0.7	
100 - 249	25.5	72.7	1.8	
250 - 999	37.2	62.8	0	
1,000 and Over	23.3	70.0	6.7	
Total	23.1	74.6	2.3	

Table D-3

PERCENT OF COMPANIES HAVING LIBRARIES REPORTED BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

District	Have Company Library	Do Not Have Company Library	No Answer	Total
I. Upper Peninsula	7.7	84.6	7.7	100.0
II. Northern Michigan	14.3	85.7	0	
III. Central Michigan	9.5	90.5	0	
IV. Grand Rapids-Muskegon Area	25.7	71.4	2.9	
V. Flint-Saginaw Area	22.2	77.8	0	
VI. Lansing Area	22.6	77.4	0	
VII. Suburban Detroit (other than Wayne County)	19.7	78.7	1.6	
VIII. Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	21.8	74.6	3.6	
IX. Southeast Michigan (Ann Arbor-Jackson)	29.3	70.7	0	
X. Wayne County	27.9	72.1	0	
Total	23.1	74.6	2.3	

Table D-4

NUMBER SELECTING
MOST IMPORTANT TYPE OF LIBRARY BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT

District	Type of Library							
	Public	Schools	Own Company Library	All Other Business	Michigan Colleges & Universities	Out-of-State	Personal	Total
I. Upper Peninsula	3	0	3	0	0	1	0	7
II. Northern Michigan	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
III. Central Michigan	3	0	2	1	3	0	0	9
IV. Grand Rapids- Muskegon Area	20	0	12	3	0	0	2	37
V. Flint-Saginaw Area	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	10
VI. Lansing Area	10	0	4	0	1	0	0	15
VII. Suburban Detroit (excluding Wayne County)	15	0	4	1	0	0	0	20
VIII. Southwest Michigan (Kalamazoo)	14	0	10	1	2	2	2	31
IX. Southeast Michigan (Ann Arbor-Jackson)	6	0	8	1	5	0	0	20
X. Wayne County	27	1	10	3	0	0	0	41
No Answer	7	0	11	2	1	0	0	21
Total	112	2	69	13	12	3	4	215

Table D-5

FREQUENCY OF USE OF COMPANY LIBRARIES BY SIZE OF COMPANY BASED ON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

	Frequency						
Number of Employees	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	Never	No Answer	Total
Less than 25	54.3	17.4	2.2	21.7	2.2	2.2	100.0
25 - 99	44.8	34.5	13.8	6.9	0	0	
100 - 249	30.8	23.1	15.4	15.4	7.7	7.7	
250 - 999	17.6	11.8	17.6	47.1	0	5.9	
1,000 and Over	0	14.3	57.1	28.6	0	0	
Total	40.2	21.4	12.5	21.4	1.8	2.7	

Table D-6

FREQUENCY OF USE OF LIBRARIES (OTHER THAN COMPANY LIBRARY)

Libraries (Listed by at Least Five Respondents)	Number of Respondents Reporting Use					
	Several Times a Week	Once a Week	Monthly	Infrequently	No Answer	Total
Public						
Dearborn	0	0	0	5	0	5
Detroit	2	4	10	27	1	44
Grand Rapids	0	0	1	12	1	14
Hackley	0	1	4	4	0	9
Herrick	0	1	0	3	1	5
Kalamazoo	0	0	0	8	0	8
Lansing	0	0	2	3	0	5
All Others	0	6	15	62	2	85
Michigan State Library	0	0	1	5	0	6
Schools	0	0	0	2	1	3
Business	0	2	1	15	1	19
Michigan Colleges and Universities						
University of Michigan	0	0	2	10	0	12
All Others	0	1	2	4	2	9
Out-of-State	0	1	0	3	0	4
Personal	3	3	2	0	0	8
Total	5	19	40	163	9	236

Table D-7

ADEQUACY OF COMPANY LIBRARIES BY SIZE OF COMPANY BASED ON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

	Adequacy					
Number of Employees	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer	Total
Less than 25	17.4	39.1	37.0	6.5	0	100.0
25 - 99	24.1	13.8	48.3	3.4	10.3	
100 - 249	23.1	53.9	15.4	0	7.7	
250 - 999	11.8	29.4	41.2	17.6	0	
1,000 and Over	0	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.8	
Total	17.9	31.3	37.5	7.1	6.3	

APPENDIX E

Exhibit I

Questions to All Faculty Members of Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Michigan

(Form of Questionnaire Follows)

WILL YOU HELP US TO IMPROVE YOUR LIBRARY SERVICE?

Completing this questionnaire will take 10 - 15 minutes of your time..

March 7, 1966

Dear Faculty Member:

In the interest of improving library service to Michigan college and university faculty and students we have engaged Nelson Associates to conduct a survey into library needs and resources. There are no comprehensive data now available concerning patterns of library use or assessment by users of the strengths and weaknesses of libraries. This questionnaire is part of an effort to elicit these data.

Your response will help provide the information for proposing solutions for improved library service to you, your colleagues, and your students. We appreciate your cooperation in answering these questions. Your signature is optional, but your responses will be held confidential.

Tabulations will be based on replies received by March 28, 1966. A postage paid envelope is attached for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Genevieve M. Casey

Genevieve M. Casey
Michigan State Librarian

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

If you are not a faculty member (or a teaching assistant or research associate) and have received this questionnaire in error, please check here ☐ and return in the attached envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS: Check the box of the answer that best applies; some questions have several components (A, B, etc.) and all components should be answered; a few replies require writing in some information. Please return the completed questionnaire in the attached envelope.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

With which Michigan college or university are you associated? (If more than one, indicate the one with which you are primarily associated and consider it your campus for subsequent questions.)

____

Office Use
1-5 ____________
6/1
7-8 ____________

PART I. FACULTY LIBRARY NEEDS (Answer Part I only on the basis of your professional needs.)

1. For the following libraries within the State of Michigan how frequently do you personally visit each. (Check the box in the column which best applies for each.)

	Several times a week	Once a week	Monthly	Infre-quently	Never
Your campus library	☐ 9-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4	☐ -5
Other Michigan college/university library (not your campus)					
Univ. of Michigan (Ann Arbor)	☐ 10-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4	☐ -5
Mich. State U. (East Lansing)	☐ 11-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4	☐ -5
Wayne State Univ. (Detroit)	☐ 12-1	☐ -2	☐ -3.	☐ -4	☐ -5
Detroit Public Library System	☐ 13-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4	☐ -5
The State Library (Lansing)	☐ 14-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4	☐ -5

2. If you personally visit any other libraries within the State of Michigan (college or university n listed above, public libraries, special libraries, private libraries, etc.), list them and indicate how frequently you use each. (List and check the box in the column which best applies.)

Library (list by name):		Several times a week	Once a week	Monthly	Infre-quently
______________________	(15-16)	☐ 17-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
______________________	(18-19)	☐ 20-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
______________________	(21-22)	☐ 23-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
______________________	(24-25)	☐ 26-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4

3. For the following libraries located outside the State of Michigan indicate to what extent you personally visit each. (Check the box in the column which best applies for each.)

		At least once a month	Several times a year	Rarely	Never
University of Chicago Library		☐ 27-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
Northwestern Univ. Library		☐ 28-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
John Crerar Library		☐ 29-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
Center for Research Libraries (formerly Midwest Inter-Library Center)		☐ 30-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
Notre Dame University Library		☐ 31-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
Other (specify):					
______________________	(32-33)	☐ 34-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	
______________________	(35-36)	☐ 37-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	

4. Of the libraries you use which one is the most important for your own needs? (38-39)

Your campus library ☐ -01

Another library______________________ ☐ -
(specify)

5. To the extent that you use libraries other than your campus library, indicate the main reason(why?

Convenient hours	☐ 40-1
Conveniently located	☐ -2
Comfortable facilities	☐ -3
Depth of the specialized collection	☐ -4
General breadth of the collection	☐ -5
Quality of reference service	☐ -6
Stack privileges	☐ -7
Availability of government documents	☐ -8
Broader selection of periodicals	☐ -9
Liberal loan policies	☐ 41-1
Other (specify):	

____

____

____

6. In which of these broad areas would you place your field of specialization? (Check one and specify your field in the space to the right.)

Area (check one):		Field (specify):
Humanities	☐ 42-1	________________
Social Sciences	☐ -2	________________
Biological Sciences	☐ -3	________________
Physical Sciences	☐ -4	________________

7. Are you engaged in any research at the present time? Yes ☐ No ☐ 43-1

If yes, is it for a degree? Yes ☐ No ☐ -2

If yes, what degree?

Doctorate ☐ -3 Masters ☐ -4 Other ________________ (specify) ☐ -5

In your field of specialization, how frequently do you use the following library materials (indicate for each):

A. Periodicals, serials, journals? Often ☐ 44-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

B. Monographs? Often ☐ 45-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

C. Government Documents? Often ☐ 46-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

D. Manuscripts? Often ☐ 47-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

E. Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audiovisual material? Often ☐ 48-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

How frequently do you use the following library services of your campus library? (Indicate for each and answer the sub-question when applicable):

A. Inter-library loans? Often ☐ 49-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

How adequate for your needs is the inter-library loan service at your campus library?

Very good ☐ 50-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4 Don't know ☐ -8

If fair or poor, what is the major deficiency in the service?

________________________________ 51-

B. Xerox or photoduplication? Often ☐ 52-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

How adequate for your needs is the Xerox or photoduplication service at your campus library?

Very good ☐ 53-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4 Don't know ☐ -8

If fair or poor, what is the major deficiency in the service?

________________________________ 54-

C. Microfilm readers/printers? Often ☐ 55-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

How adequate for your needs are the microfilm reader/printer services at your campus library?

Very good ☐ 56-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4 Don't know ☐ -8

If fair or poor, what is the major deficiency in the service?

________________________________ 57-

10. To what extent do you rely on the staff of your campus library for professional assistance in locating information?

Often ☐ 58-1 Occasionally ☐ -2 Never ☐ -3

11. In your work how necessary is free access to the stacks?

Essential ☐ 59-1 Worthwhile ☐ -2 Incidental ☐ -3

12. How adequate is your campus library collection in your field of specialization?

Very good ☐ 60-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

13. In your judgment, what library in the State of Michigan has the best collection of material in your field of specialization?

_______________________________ (61-62)

14. What is your academic rank?

Full Professor ☐ 63-1 Associate Professor ☐ -2 Assistant Professor ☐ -3

Instructor (lecturer) ☐ -4 Research Associate ☐ -5 Graduate Assistant (teaching fellow, etc.) ☐ - 6 Other ______________ (specify) ☐ -7

15. What is your length of service at this institution?

1 year or less ☐ 64-1 Over 1 year to 3 years ☐ -2 Over 3 years to 5 years ☐ -3

Over 5 years to 10 years ☐ -4 Over 10 years ☐ -5

Have you any additional comments about your library needs?

If you do not teach undergraduate students, check here ☐ and omit Part II. Please proceed to Part III.

Office Use	
1-5	
6/2	
7-8	
9	

PART II. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' LIBRARY NEEDS (to be completed only by those teaching undergraduate students).

1. For meeting the overall needs of your undergraduate students, how adequate is your campus library in terms of each of the following? (Indicate for each.)

A. Depth of the collection in the fields you teach?

Very good ☐ 10-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

B. General breadth of the collection?

Very good ☐ 11-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

C. Availability of multiple copies?

Very good ☐ 12-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

D. Availability of seating space?

Very good ☐ 13-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

2. In preparing course work do you usually tailor the reading lists to the materials available in your campus library?

Yes ☐ 14-1 No ☐ -2 Don't use reading lists ☐ -3

If yes, to what extent does this restrict you in compiling reading lists?

Not at all ☐ 15-1 Somewhat ☐ -2 Significantly ☐ -3 Severely ☐ -4

← OPEN

3. Do you usually expect your undergraduate students to use the resources of libraries other than your campus library for:

A. Course work? Yes ☐ 16-1 No ☐ -2

B. Term papers and other special assignments? Yes ☐ 17-1 No ☐ -2

4. To your knowledge, what libraries, other than your campus library, are used by your undergraduate students? (List in descending order beginning with the library most used.)

Library (list by name):

______________________________(18-19)

______________________________(20-21)

______________________________(22-23)

5. On the basis of your teaching plans, will your future undergraduate students have to place more, about the same, or less reliance on the following library materials. (Indicate for each.)

	More	The same	Less	No need now or in the future
A. Periodicals, serials, journals?	☐ 24-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
B. Monographs?	☐ 25-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
C. Government Documents?	☐ 26-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
D. Manuscripts?	☐ 27-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
E. Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audiovisual material?	☐ 28-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4

Have you any additional comments about undergraduate students' library needs?

If you do not teach graduate students or supervise graduate study, check here ☐ and omit Part III. Please return your completed questionnaire in the attached envelope.

PART III: GRADUATE STUDENTS' LIBRARY NEEDS (to be completed only by those supervising graduate study).

Office Use
1-5______________
6/3
7-8______________

1. In what field(s) of specialization do you teach graduate students or supervise graduate study?

______________________________(9-10)

2. For meeting the overall needs of your graduate students, how adequate is your campus library in terms of each of the following. (Indicate for each.)

A. Depth of the collection in the fields you teach?

Very good ☐ 11-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

B. General breadth of the collection?

Very good ☐ 12-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

C. Availability of multiple copies?

Very good ☐ 13-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

3. In preparing course and seminar work do you usually tailor the reading lists to the materials available in your campus library?

Yes ☐ 14-1 No ☐ -2 Don't use reading lists ☐ -3

If yes, to what extent does this restrict you in compiling reading lists?

Not at all ☐ 15-1 Somewhat ☐ -2 Significantly ☐ -3 Severely ☐ -4

4. In the selection of research and thesis topics do you usually tailor the reading lists to the materials available in your campus library?

Yes ☐ 16-1 No ☐ -2 Don't use reading lists ☐ -

If yes, to what extent does this restrict you in compiling reading lists?

Not at all ☐ 17-1 Somewhat ☐ -2 Significantly ☐ -3 Severely ☐ -4

5. Do you usually expect your graduate students to use the resources of libraries other than your campus library for:

A.	Course and seminar work?	Yes ☐ 18-1	No ☐ -2
B.	Term papers and other special assignments?	Yes ☐ 19-1	No ☐ -2
C.	Theses, dissertations?	Yes ☐ 20-1	No ☐ -2

6. To your knowledge, what libraries, other than your campus library, are used by your graduate students? (List in descending order beginning with the library most used.)

Library (list by name):

______________________________(21-22)

______________________________(23-24)

______________________________(25-26)

7. On the basis of your teaching plans, will your future graduate students have to place more, about the same, or less reliance on the following library materials? (Indicate for each.)

		More	The same	Less	No need now or in the future
A.	Periodicals, serials, journals?	☐ 27-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
B.	Monographs?	☐ 28-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
C.	Government documents?	☐ 29-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
D.	Manuscripts?	☐ 30-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
E.	Recordings, language tapes, films, or other audiovisual material?	☐ 31-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4

Have you any additional comments about graduate students' library needs?

Please return to:

Research Resources Library Survey
c/o Michigan State Library
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan

____
Signature (optional)

Please use attached envelope.

.. Thank you ...

Exhibit II

Questions to All Faculty Members of Off-Campus University Centers in Michigan

(Form of Questionnaire Follows)

WILL YOU HELP US TO IMPROVE LIBRARY SERVICE TO YOUR STUDENTS?

. . . Completing this questionnaire will take 5-10 minutes of your time . . .

March 25, 1966

Dear Faculty Member:

In the interest of improving library service to Michigan college and university faculty and students we have engaged Nelson Associates to conduct a survey into library needs and resources. There are no comprehensive data now available concerning patterns of library use or assessment by users of the strengths and weaknesses of libraries. This questionnaire is part of an effort to elicit these data.

Your response will help provide the information for proposing solutions for improved library service to your students. We appreciate your cooperation in answering these questions. Your signature is optional, and your responses will be held confidential.

Tabulations will be based on replies received by April 13, 1966. A postage paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Genevieve M. Casey

Genevieve M. Casey
Michigan State Librarian

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

If you have not been an off-campus teaching faculty member and have received this questionnaire in error, please check here ☐ and return in the enclosed envelope.

If you are a regular member of the college faculty you may have received a questionnaire about your library needs and those of your on-campus students. This additional questionnaire is confined exclusively to the library needs of off-campus students.

INSTRUCTIONS: Check the box of the answer that best applies; a few replies require writing in some information. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

* *

OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS' LIBRARY NEEDS

Office Use
1-5 ____________
6/4

1. With what Michigan off-campus education service are you associated?

Central Michigan University ☐ 7-1
Eastern Michigan University ☐ -2
Ferris State College ☐ -3
Michigan State University ☐ -4
Michigan Technological University ☐ -5
Northern Michigan University ☐ -6
University of Michigan ☐ -7
Wayne State University ☐ -8
Western Michigan University ☐ -9

2. Where (i.e. city) do you teach? (If more than one place, indicate the one you are primarily associated with and answer subsequent questions with reference to that one.)

________________________________(8-9)

3. In which of these broad areas do you teach off-campus courses? (Check one area and specify the field in the space to the right.)

Area (check one):		Field (specify):
Humanities	☐ 10-1	____________
Social sciences	☐ -2	____________
Biological sciences	☐ -3	____________
Physical sciences	☐ -4	____________
Professional (business, engineering, education, etc.)	☐ -5	____________

4. Do you teach (check one)

credit courses? ☐ 11-1 or non-credit courses? ☐ -2 or both? ☐ -3

5. Is there a permanent library collection at your off-campus teaching site?

Yes ☐ 12-1 No ☐ -2

IF YES, how adequate overall is it for the needs of your off-campus students?

Very good ☐ 13-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

6. To your knowledge, what libraries (other than your teaching site library) are used by your off-campus students and how adequate overall is each? (List each library and check the box in the column which best describes adequacy.)

Library (list by name):	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
____________(14-16)	☐ 17-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
____________(18-20)	☐ 21-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
____________(22-24)	☐ 25-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4

7. Do you personally carry library books and materials to your off-campus courses to loan to students?

Yes ☐ 26-1 No ☐ -2

8. Are additional library materials provided for your specific course when it is taught off-campus?

Yes ☐ 27-1 No ☐ -2

IF YES, by what agency?

Campus library	☐	**28-1**
Extension or field services	☐	**-2**
Local public library	☐	**-3**
The State Library	☐	**-4**
Other ________________ (specify)	☐	**-5**

9. In preparing off-campus course work do you tailor the reading assignments to materials available locally?

Yes ☐ 29-1 No ☐ -2

IF YES, to what extent does this restrict you in compiling reading lists?

Not at all ☐ 30-1 Somewhat ☐ -2 Significantly ☐ -3 Severely ☐ -4

10. On the basis of your teaching plans, will future off-campus students have to place more, about the same, or less reliance on library resources?

More ☐ 31-1 The same ☐ -2 Less ☐ -3

IF YOU TEACH THE SAME COURSES OFF-CAMPUS AND ON-CAMPUS FOR THE SAME INSTITUTION, ANSWER QUESTION 11.

11. Are there any differences in the assignments made to your off-campus students and to your on-campus students?

Yes ☐ 32-1 No ☐ -2

IF YES,

A. Are the differences in assignments due to differences in library resources?

No ☐ 33-1 Yes, partially ☐ -2 Yes, mostly ☐ -3 Yes, entirely ☐ 4

B. IF YES (in A), indicate for the following:

	More available off-campus	Same	Less available off-campus
General reference and background material	☐ 34-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Multiple copies of important titles	☐ 35-1	☐ -2	☐ -3

	More complete off-campus	Same	Less complete off-campus
Subject matter collections in the fields you teach	☐ 36-1	☐ -2	☐ -3

C. How do these factors taken together (in B above) affect the achievement of your off-campus students?

Not at all ☐ 37-1 Favorably ☐ -2 Adversely ☐ -3

D. Do you use a text in your off-campus course but not in your on-campus course because of the difference in the availability of library resources?

Yes ☐ 38-1 No ☐ -2

Have you any additional comments about your off-campus students' library needs?

Please return in enclosed envelope to:
Research Resources Library Survey
c/o Michigan State Library
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan

Signature (optional)

. . . Thank you . . .

Exhibit III

Questions to a Sample of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in Michigan

(Form of Questionnaire Follows)

WILL YOU HELP US TO IMPROVE YOUR LIBRARY SERVICE?

. . . Completing this questionnaire will take about 5 minutes of your time . . .

March 21, 1966

Dear Teacher:

In the interest of improving library service at the reference and research level we have engaged Nelson Associates to conduct a survey. There are no comprehensive data now available concerning patterns of library use or assessment by users of the strengths and weaknesses of libraries. This questionnaire is part of an effort to elicit these data.

You are one of the few selected teachers who have been drawn for our random sample to receive this questionnaire. Your response is very important for the accuracy of our data and will help provide the information for proposing solutions for improved library service to you and your colleagues. We appreciate your cooperation in answering these questions. Your signature is optional, but your responses will be held confidential.

Tabulations will be based on replies received by April 11, 1966. A postage paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Genevieve M. Casey

Genevieve M. Casey
Michigan State Librarian

* *

If you are not an elementary or secondary school teacher and have received this questionnaire in error, please check here ☐ and return in the attached envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS: Check the box of the answer that best applies; a few replies require writing in some information. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

* *

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' LIBRARY NEEDS

(Answer this questionnaire on the basis of your own professional needs.)

Office Use
1-5 ______________
6/5

1. Do you teach (check one)

   elementary school? ☐ 7-1 or secondary school? ☐ -2 or both? ☐ -3

2. In what county do you teach? (Circle the county number.) (8-9)

1. Alcona
2. Alger
3. Allegan
4. Alpena
5. Antrim
6. Arenac
7. Baraga
8. Barry
9. Bay
10. Benzie
11. Berrien
12. Branch
13. Calhoun
14. Cass
15. Charlevoix
16. Cheboygan
17. Chippewa
18. Clare
19. Clinton
20. Crawford
21. Delta
22. Dickinson
23. Eaton
24. Emmet
25. Genesee
26. Gladwin
27. Gogebic
28. Grand Traverse
29. Gratiot
30. Hillsdale
31. Houghton
32. Huron
33. Ingham
34. Ionia
35. Iosco
36. Iron
37. Isabella
38. Jackson
39. Kalamazoo
40. Kalkaska
41. Kent
42. Keweenaw
43. Lake
44. Lapeer
45. Leelanau
46. Lenawee
47. Livingston
48. Luce
49. Mackinac
50. Macomb
51. Manistee
52. Marquette
53. Mason
54. Mecosta
55. Menominee
56. Midland
57. Missaukee
58. Monroe
59. Montcalm
60. Montmorency
61. Muskegon
62. Newaygo
63. Oakland
64. Oceana
65. Ogemaw
66. Ontonagon
67. Osceola
68. Oscoda
69. Otsego
70. Ottawa
71. Presque Isle
72. Roscommon
73. Saginaw
74. St. Clair
75. St. Joseph
76. Sanilac
77. Schoolcraft
78. Shiawassee
79. Tuscola
80. Van Buren
81. Washtenaw
82. Wayne
83. Wexford

3. **What libraries (including bookmobiles), if any, do you periodically use for your professional needs and how frequently do you use each? (List and check the box in the column which best describes your frequency of use.)**

If no library used periodically, check here ☐ and skip to question 8.

Library (list by name):		**Several times a week**	**Once a week**	**Monthly**	**Infrequently**
____________________	**(10-12)**	☐ **13-1**	☐ **-2**	☐ **-3**	☐ **-4**
____________________	**(14-16)**	☐ **17-1**	☐ **-2**	☐ **-3**	☐ **-4**
____________________	**(18-20)**	☐ **21-1**	☐ **-2**	☐ **-3**	☐ **-4**

4. **Of the libraries you listed (in question #3) which one is the most important for your professional needs?** ____________________ **(22-24)**

5. **How adequate overall is it for your professional needs?**

Very good ☐ 25-1 Good ☐ -2 Fair ☐ -3 Poor ☐ -4

6. **Is it (i.e. the most important library) the most conveniently located library for you?**

Yes ☐ 26-1 No ☐ -2

IF NO, indicate the main reason(s) why it is nevertheless the most important library (question #4) for you even though it is not the most conveniently located:

Convenient hours	☐ **27-1**
Comfortable facilities	☐ **28-1**
Depth of the specialized collection	☐ **29-1**
General breadth of the collection	☐ **30-1**
Quality of reference service	☐ **31-1**
Stack privileges	☐ **32-1**
Availability of government documents	☐ **33-1**
Broader selection of periodicals	☐ **34-1**
Liberal loan policies	☐ **35-1**
Other (specify):	
____________________	**36-**
____________________	**37-**

7. In which areas of the following two lists do you periodically use library materials? (Check as many as apply.)

Curriculum Areas

Social Studies ☐ 38-1
History ☐ 39-1
Geography ☐ 40-1
Science ☐ 41-1
Mathematics ☐ 42-1
English ☐ 43-1
Foreign Languages ☐ 44-1
Speech ☐ 45-1
Art ☐ 46-1
Music ☐ 47-1
Home Economics ☐ 48-1
Business ☐ 49-1
Physical Education & Recreation ☐ 50-1
Other (specify):
____________________ 51-

Professional Education Areas

Foundations of Education ☐ 52-1
Educational Administration ☐ 53-1
Counseling ☐ 54-1
Special Education ☐ 55-1
Guidance ☐ 56-1
Student Personnel Administration ☐ 57-1
Curriculum Planning ☐ 58-1
Teaching Methods ☐ 59-1
Other (specify):
____________________ 60-

8. Are you presently engaged in any research other than that required for an academic degree?

Yes ☐ 61-1 No ☐ -2

9. What is the highest academic degree you now hold?

Doctorate ☐ 62-1 Masters ☐ -2 Bachelors ☐ -3 Other ________________ (specify) ☐ -4

10. **Are you presently engaged in graduate work for an advanced degree?**

Yes, doctorate ☐ 63-1 Yes, masters ☐-2 Yes, other ______________ ☐ -3 No ☐ -4
(specify)

IF YES, at what institution? ______________________ (64-65)

11. **How long have you been teaching in the State of Michigan?**

2 years or less ☐ 66-1 Over 2 years to 5 years ☐ -2
Over 5 years to 10 years ☐ -3 Over 10 years ☐ -4

Have you any additional comments about your library needs?

Please return to:

Research Resources Library Survey
c/o Michigan State Library
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan

____
Signature (optional)

Please use enclosed envelope.

. . . Thank you . . .

Exhibit IV

Questions to a Sample of Manufacturing Executives in Michigan

(Form of Questionnaire Follows)

. . . Completing this questionnaire will take only 5 minutes of your time . . .

April 6, 1966

Dear Sir:

The State Board of Libraries is sponsoring a survey conducted by Nelson Associates in cooperation with Michigan colleges, universities, industrial firms, and other professional organizations. We believe that Michigan business can benefit from improved access to research resources.

Because vast quantities of material must be absorbed by businessmen, I am sure you will agree that any improvements in library service which will facilitate this task will be welcomed.

You are one of the few selected businessmen who has been drawn for our random sample to receive this questionnaire. Your response is very important for the accuracy of our data and will provide the information we need to make our survey a success. We would greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Tabulations will be based on replies received by April 25, 1966. A postage paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Genevieve M. Casey
Michigan State Librarian

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

If you are not a business executive and have received this questionnaire, please check here ☐ and return in the enclosed envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS: Check the box of the answer that best applies; a few replies require writing in some information. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Office Use
1-5 ____________
6/6

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(Please answer on the basis of your own professional business needs only.)

1. In what area of activity is your primary executive responsibility? (Check only the most important one.)

Accounting	☐ 7-1	General Management	☐ -4	Production	☐ -7
Engineering	☐ -2	Marketing	☐ -5	Research	☐ -8
Finance	☐ -3	Personnel/Industrial Relations	☐ -6	Other ____________ (specify)	☐ -9

2. About how many employees are there in your company?

Less than 25	☐ 8-1	25-99	☐ -2	100-249	☐ -3
250-999	☐ -4	1,000-9,999	☐ -5	Over 10,000	☐ -6

3. In what county do you work? (Circle the county number.) (9-10)

1. Alcona
2. Alger
3. Allegan
4. Alpena
5. Antrim
6. Arenac
7. Baraga
8. Barry
9. Bay
10. Benzie
11. Berrien
12. Branch
13. Calhoun
14. Cass
15. Charlevoix
16. Cheboygan
17. Chippewa
18. Clare
19. Clinton
20. Crawford
21. Delta
22. Dickinson
23. Eaton
24. Emmet
25. Genesee
26. Gladwin
27. Gogebic
28. Grand Traverse
29. Gratiot
30. Hillsdale
31. Houghton
32. Huron
33. Ingham
34. Ionia
35. Iosco
36. Iron
37. Isabella
38. Jackson
39. Kalamazoo
40. Kalkaska
41. Kent
42. Keweenaw
43. Lake
44. Lapeer
45. Leelanau
46. Lenawee
47. Livingston
48. Luce
49. Mackinac
50. Macomb
51. Manistee
52. Marquette
53. Mason
54. Mecosta
55. Menominee
56. Midland
57. Missaukee
58. Monroe
59. Montcalm
60. Montmorency
61. Muskegon
62. Newaygo
63. Oakland
64. Oceana
65. Ogemaw
66. Ontonagon
67. Osceola
68. Oscoda
69. Otsego
70. Ottawa
71. Presque Isle
72. Roscommon
73. Saginaw
74. St. Clair
75. St. Joseph
76. Sanilac
77. Schoolcraft
78. Shiawassee
79. Tuscola
80. Van Buren
81. Washtenaw
82. Wayne
83. Wexford

4. For keeping abreast of developments in your area of executive responsibility which of the following are the most important? (Indicate not more than four items by assigning a "1" to the most important; a "2" to the second most important, etc.)

Assign 1, 2, 3, 4 in order of importance in these boxes

Newspapers 11-☐

Business magazines (Business Week, Nation's Business, etc.) 12-☐

Professional journals (Harvard Business Review, The Journal of Accountancy, etc.) 13-☐

Subscription services (Kiplinger Letter, NICB reports, etc.) 14-☐

Books 15-☐

Conventions 16-☐

Seminars, conferences 17-☐

Informal conversations with associates 18-☐

Technical reports 19-☐

Company memoranda 20-☐

Other: ______________________ 21- 22-☐
(specify)

5. At your place of work does your company have a library (i.e., an organized collection of books, periodicals and other materials available to company personnel and staffed at least part time)?

Yes ☐ 23-1   No ☐ -2

IF YES, how frequently do you use your company library?

Several times/wk. ☐ 24-1   Once a week ☐ -2   Monthly ☐ -3   Infrequently ☐ -4   Never ☐ -5

How adequate, for your professional business needs, is it?

Very good ☐ 25-1   Good ☐ -2   Fair ☐ -3   Poor ☐ -4   Don't know ☐ -8

6. What libraries, if any, other than your company library, do you periodically use for your professional business needs and how frequently do you use each? (List and check the box best describing frequency of use.)

Library (list by name):	Several times/wk.	Once a week	Monthly	Infrequently
______________________ (26-28)	☐ 29-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
______________________ (30-32)	☐ 33-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4
______________________ (34-36)	☐ 37-1	☐ -2	☐ -3	☐ -4

7. Of the libraries you use which one is the most important for your own professional business needs?

Your company library ☐ (38-40)-001   Another library ______________________ ☐ -
(specify)

8. To the extent you use libraries other than your company library for your professional business needs, indicate the main reason(s) why:

No company library ☐ 41-1
Convenient hours ☐ 42-1
Conveniently located ☐ 43-1
Comfortable facilities ☐ 44-1
Depth of the specialized collection ☐ 45-1
General breadth of the collection ☐ 46-1
Quality of reference service ☐ 47-1
Stack privileges ☐ 48-1
Availability of government documents ☐ 49-1
Broader selection of periodicals ☐ 50-1
Liberal loan policies ☐ 51-1
Other: ______________________ ☐ 52-
____
(specify)

9. In which of the following subject matter areas . . .

(a) . . do you recurrently use library materials? (Check in column A below.)

(b) . . would you use library materials if they were readily available? (Check in column B below.)

Subject matter area	Column A Recurrently use	Column B Would use	Office use only
Accounting	☐ 53-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Finance	☐ 54-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Engineering	☐ 55-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Science	☐ 56-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Production	☐ 57-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Industrial relations	☐ 58-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Personnel administration	☐ 59-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Management theory	☐ 60-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Marketing	☐ 61-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
International business	☐ 62-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Data processing	☐ 63-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Operations research	☐ 64-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Statistics	☐ 65-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Government regulations	☐ 66-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Reference material (atlases, dictionaries, Who's Who directories, etc.)	☐ 67-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
Other: ______________________ 68- (specify)	☐ 69-1	☐ -2	☐ -3
None	☐ 70-1	☐ -2	☐ -3

Have you additional comments?

Please return in enclosed envelope to:
Research Resources Library Survey
c/o Michigan State Library
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan

____
Signature (optional)

. . . Thank you . . .

END 1-21-69